DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 360 24 SP 003 751

AUTHOR	Massanari, Karl
TITLE	Feasibility Project Involving the Experimental Application in Eight Pilot Institutions of the Proposed New Standards for Accrediting Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0248
PUB DATE	Mar 70
CONTRACT	OEC-3-8-080248-0030(010)
NOTE	181p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions), College Programs, *Evaluation, *Feasibility Studies, *Standards, *Teacher Education, Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This project was the field research component of a 3-year study designed to formulate new and improved accrediting standards for teacher education. The purpose of the project was two-fold: (1) to field test the workability of the proposed new standards from the standpoint of eight institutions seeking initial accreditation or reaccreditation, and (2) to test their workability from the standpoint of the accrediting agency (National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE), at each level of its operation--on-site visits by visiting teams, case studies and recommendations by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, and action on accreditability by the Council. The proposed standards were then revised in light of the test findings and adopted in January, 1970, (see SP 003 720, also Appendix H of this report) as the official standards of accreditation for teacher education, to be effective for all institutions during the 1971-72 school year. Included in the document is a description of the procedures, responses, and findings of the feasibility study and a summary of the major revisions of the proposed standards which resulted from these findings. A variety of related materials appear in Appendixes A-J, including evaluative instruments used, drafts of the proposed and approved standards (with study guides), and an analysis of the differences between the new standards and the former ones. [Not available in hardcopy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JES)

ED0 38360

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-0248

Contract No. OEC-3-8-080248-0030 (010)

FEASIBILITY PROJECT INVOLVING THE EXPERIMENTAL APPLICATION IN EIGHT PILOT INSTITUTIONS OF THE PROPOSED NEW STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITING TEACHER EDUCATION

A Project sponsored jointly by the
American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education and the National
Council for Accreditation of Teacher
Education

Karl Massanari, Associate Director
The American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

March 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SP003751

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

Contents

Preface

Summary

Introduction 1

The Feasibility Project 5

Findings of the Feasibility Project 13

Major Revisions of the Proposed Standards Resulting from Project Findings 31

Adoption of the New Standards and Next Steps 33

Footnotes 34

Appendixes 36

PREFACE

The AACTE expresses its appreciation to the many persons, institutions, and agencies for their many contributions of time and resources without which the new standards for teacher education could not have been developed. The support of the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education, the ESSO Education Foundation, and the United States Steel Foundation supplemented in a significant way the funding provided by the Association and its member institutions to conduct the three-year Evaluative Criteria Study of which the Feasibility Project is a part.

For the success of this project, special words of commendation are offered to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and its staff, members of the eight visiting teams, members of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, the eight pilot colleges and universities, and to the members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee.

The counsel of Glenn Boerrigter and Howard Cummings, Bureau of Research, USOE, was helpful to the project staff, especially during the planning stage of this project.

Karl Massanari

Karl Massanari, Director of the
Feasibility Project

Richard L. James

Richard L. James, Associate
Director of the Feasibility Project

SUMMARY

The Feasibility Project was the field research component of a three-year study by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The major goal of the study was the formulation of new and improved accrediting standards for teacher education. Following a year of preparatory activity, including an opinion survey of the former standards and regional conferences to discuss issues and collect ideas, an AACTE committee drafted a preliminary set of new standards for basic and advanced teacher education programs. Under this project, the proposed standards were field-tested in eight colleges and universities to determine their workability from the standpoint of both the institutions and the accrediting agency (the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education).

The pilot tests, conducted in cooperation with NCATE, utilized the basic accreditation procedures normally used by that agency. These included the preparation of a comprehensive report by the institution, an on-campus visit and the preparation of a report by an official visiting team, a case study and the formulation of a recommendation on accreditability by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, and an action on accreditability by the Council. To achieve the objectives of this project, additional procedures were employed. Institutional representatives and all personnel used by the accrediting agency were oriented regarding the new standards and the project objectives. Oral and written evaluations concerning the workability of the new standards were obtained from all major participants. A final one-day evaluation session was held involving the participation of five consultants; the Council; members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee; visiting team chairmen; representatives of the pilot institutions, AACTE Executive Committee, and the Visitation and Appraisal Committee; and the project staff.

The proposed accreditation standards were revised in light of the results of the eight tests and in October 1969 the new standards were approved by the AACTE Executive Committee for transmittal to NCATE. In January 1970, the Council adopted the recommendations as the official standards for accrediting basic and advanced programs for the preparation of professional school personnel. They become effective for all institutions seeking accreditation or reaccreditation by NCATE during the 1971-1972 school year. In the interim, institutions may elect to be evaluated by NCATE on the basis of either the former or the new standards.

INTRODUCTION

National standards for accrediting programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel periodically need to be reviewed and updated. The revision of the former standards used by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was considered fundamentally so important that the revision process ought to include the continued participation of many individuals and groups concerned with teacher education, and the pilot testing of any proposals before they were submitted for adoption. It was on the basis of these premises that the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) began, in late 1966, its assignment to develop new accreditation standards for NCATE.

THE AACTE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA STUDY

In 1965, NCATE was unconditionally approved by the National Commission on Accrediting as the agency for the national accreditation of programs for the preparation of teachers, educational administrators, and other specialized school personnel. Approval was granted in part as a result of certain revisions incorporated in the NCATE constitution that year, among which was the provision that AACTE is the agency responsible for systematically studying and revising the accreditation standards.

Accordingly, in early 1965, the AACTE Executive Committee appointed an ad hoc committee[1] to lay the groundwork for an Association study leading to a revision of the present NCATE accreditation standards, and later in the same year, a study committee[2] widely representative of various interests in teacher education. A professional staff person was employed to work with the study committee. This group, known as the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, was requested to complete by 1969 a threefold assignment: to study the present NCATE standards and recommend appropriate revisions; to identify problems for research, the results of which might ultimately lead to a validation of the new standards; and to make recommendations for the continuous appraisal of standards by AACTE. The assumption was that the study, from its inception, was to be done with thoroughness and not on a crash-program basis.

RESEARCH PHASE

During the first phase of the study (August 1966-June 1967), the committee devoted its efforts to research, study, and discussion. The major purposes were to inform, educate, stimulate discussion on issues, collect ideas, and to "feel the pulse" of responsible educators on the basic issues. An opinion survey of the present NCATE standards was conducted, involving more than 3,200 individuals who represented 1,200 teacher-preparing institutions, 50 learned societies and professional associations, the 50 state departments of education, and the teaching profession (through the National Commission on Teacher

Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association). Participants were asked to comment on the understandability, significance, and comprehensiveness of the former standards and to suggest how they might be revised (see Appendixes A-1 and A-2).

The committee identified the key issues involved in developing new accreditation standards and then commissioned five consultants to write position papers on these issues. A resource book[3] was published and distributed as a basis for discussions by nearly one thousand participants in five regional conferences held throughout the United States. The participants, representing colleges and universities, professional organizations (see Appendix B), state departments of education, and the profession, formulated position statements after discussing the issues, which had been reviewed earlier at the AACTE annual meeting in Chicago. The findings of the research phase of the study were published in the September 1967 issue of the AACTE Bulletin. A summary of the findings, as reported in this Bulletin, follows.

> "The Accreditation of Teacher Education:
>
> Strong support was given to the principle of national accreditation of teacher education.
>
> Approval for present NCATE procedures was given by roughly half of the Evaluative Criteria Study participants; another one-third gave partial approval with suggestions for modifications. The remainder either disapproved or gave no opinion.
>
> The Nature of the New Standards:
>
> The primary purpose of accreditation should be the application of an acceptability floor; the stimulation of improvement will result as a by-product, and should be fostered through specialized interest groups. Improvement should be stimulated also, over the long pull, through a periodic "raising of the acceptability floor."
>
> On the question of how the new standards should be organized, there was no large body of opinion supporting any particular pattern. Opinions ranged widely, including support for both a single set and multiple sets of standards. Some would differentiate standards on the basis of type of institution, others by level of preparation, others by accreditation status of the institution, and still others by specialization area.
>
> The standards should be explicit in nature, with specificity wherever appropriate. In addition, they should deal with the three components in a teacher education program: general education, specialization, and professional education. They should deal with certain aspects of general education -- balance, pattern, and quantity -- and the specialization

component (content), and with the whole of professional education.

Participants in the Study indicated that more attention should be given to evaluating the specialization component. It is believed by many that there should be greater coordination between NCATE and other accrediting groups (regional accrediting associations and state departments of education). The responsibility of the professional organizations and learned societies in upgrading the quality of the specialization component also was stressed by a number of participants in the Study.

The standards should apply to the following aspects of an institution's teacher education program: (a) commitment of the institution to the preparation of teachers; (b) resources -- personnel, financial, and physical -- allocated to teacher education; (c) program designed for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel, including admission and retention policies, learning experiences provided for students, evaluation of the program, et cetera; and (d) competence of graduates and prospective graduates.

The degree of institutional commitment to teacher education can be determined in the main by a consideration of the resources allocated to the program, quality of the faculty, climate of the institution (which may either foster or stifle innovation and experimentation), and the kinds and quality of learning experiences provided for students.

There was very substantial support for greater emphasis in the standards on evaluating the "product" -- the graduates and prospective graduates of teacher education programs. Many participants said that the institution should be held responsible for developing ways to demonstrate the competence of its prospective graduates.

The Substance of the New Standards:

The new standards should: (a) give less attention to the institutional structure (organization and administration) for teacher education; (b) include a greater emphasis on evaluating the prospective graduates of teacher education programs; (c) be explicit on the encouragement of innovation and experimentation in teacher education.

The role of research, educational technology, and other recent developments in teacher education should be given a more prominent place in the standards.

The new standards should make possible a more effective evaluation of graduate programs for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel.

There should be a sharper focus in the standards on the quality of learning experiences, both theoretical and laboratory, provided for students in teacher education.

The standards should include some attention to the nature of the relationships between the teacher-preparing institution and the cooperating schools. The continuing aspect of teacher education should not be overlooked.

Procedural Matters:

There is agreement among a substantial number of participants in the Study that there should be more involvement of specialized interest groups in the evaluation and accreditation of teacher education. On the question of the nature of such involvement, there was a spread of opinions ranging from support for an informal, indirect involvement to support for a formal, direct involvement in the accreditation process.

It is believed by many that the specialized interest groups have a major role to play in the improvement of teacher education. It is felt that this improvement role can be carried out most effectively through such activities as the following:

1. Preparing guidelines or standards for their respective specialization areas which might be used by institutions and existing accrediting agencies.
2. Working with institutions directly and with other professional organizations in promoting the improvement of teacher education.
3. Assisting institutions in the task of evaluating the competence of their prospective teachers (and other school personnel) through the development of sound evaluative instruments and procedures.

Widespread support was registered for the importance of having high quality institutional evaluators who are given thorough orientation and training for their assignments."

WRITING PHASE

On the basis of the findings of the first phase of the study, the committee formulated a frame of reference for writing new standards. Many hours of writing, reviewing, and revising culminated in Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: A Draft of the Proposed New Standards, with Study Guide (see Appendix C). This version of the standards was published by AACTE in December 1967, and approximately twenty-five thousand copies were distributed throughout the United States. The proposed standards incorporate many of the fundamental concepts in the former standards. There are, however, some differences: the new standards require that institutions evaluate their graduates, give serious consideration to the recommendations of professional organizations for the preparation of teachers, and provide channels for the expression of student viewpoints. Less attention is given to the importance of patterns of administrative organization for teacher education and to written statements of objectives. Attention focuses more on the elements in the professional studies component, the quality of the faculty and its instruction, the quality of the students, the place of research, and educational technology and instructional media. Greater emphasis is placed on the unique character of graduate education by providing a separate set of standards for advanced programs. The Evaluative Criteria Study Committee believes that the new standards permit considerable latitude in designing and conducting teacher education programs, even though they are more specific. It also believes that they will encourage innovation and experimentation on the part of colleges and universities.

FIRST REVISION PHASE

Recipients of the first draft were asked to submit their reactions to the committee. Nearly one thousand written reactions from individuals and groups were received between January and March 1968, including the opinions of representatives from teacher-preparing institutions, professional associations and learned societies, state departments of education, students, and the profession. At the 1968 AACTE annual meeting, approximately ninety discussion groups reviewed the proposed standards and submitted summaries of their discussions. The committee and staff also benefited from the many reactions voiced by interested participants at open hearings, during discussion periods following presentations, and through informal conversations.

After systematic study and analysis of this input, the December 1967 draft of the proposed new standards was revised by the committee in April 1968. A published summary of the revisions (see Appendix D) was also widely distributed. It was these proposed new standards (see Appendix E), as revised in April 1968, that were tested in the eight pilot institutions participating in the Feasibility Project.

THE FEASIBILITY PROJECT[4]

In keeping with the basic premise that the proposed new standards should be tested in the field before they are recommended for adoption, plans were formulated for the testing phase of the study. From the beginning, it was decided that the pilot testing of the new standards would be done on a "for real" basis; that is, the institutions involved would in fact seek accreditation or reaccreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Council would indeed use the proposed new standards to determine the accreditation status of the institutions. Accordingly, the plans for the tests were developed jointly by the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee and NCATE. The project design included the customary accreditation procedures used by NCATE: the preparation of a report by the institution seeking accreditation, an on-site visit by a team of evaluators, the preparation of a team report, a case study of the institution's teacher education program and recommendations to the Council by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, and action on the accreditation of the institution by the Council. As described below, the usual role of the visiting team was modified for the project.

In October 1967, the plans for tests were submitted to the United States Office of Education as a proposal for a feasibility project. The proposal was approved and an $85,000 contract awarded the project for the period March 15, 1968, to June 30, 1969[5]. In underwriting the major expenses involved in conducting the pilot tests, the contract made possible the orientation of key participants, follow-up evaluations of each step in the procedures, and additional professional staff[6] to man the project.

Purposes

Essentially, the purposes of the project were (1) to test the workability of the proposed new standards from the standpoint of eight institutions seeking initial accreditation or reaccreditation by NCATE, and (2) to test their workability from the standpoint of the accrediting agency (NCATE) at each level of its operation: on-site visits by visiting teams, case studies and recommendations by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, and action on accreditability by the Council. The proposed standards were then revised in light of the test findings.

It was not the purpose of the project to validate the proposed standards, important as this may be. In the judgment of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, it was not possible in a three-year period to involve the continuing participation of many individuals and groups in the development of new standards, test the workability of proposed standards, and during the same period, test the validity of the proposals. Such tests, however, need to be made, and the committee views the sponsorship of validation studies as unfinished business for the period following the adoption of the new standards by NCATE.

In relation to the experience of the institutions, answers were sought to such questions as:

1. What problems do the institutions encounter as they prepare the required reports?
2. Does the preparation of the report require a reasonable amount of time and effort?
3. Are the proposed standards self-explanatory? Is a manual or guide needed for the preparation of the report?
4. Does the amount of specificity in the new standards create any particular problems?
5. To what extent do the standards permit a reasonable degree of flexibility with respect to institutional organization for teacher education. With respect to the curriculum?
6. What difficulties do the institutions confront in evaluating their graduates?

7. What problems are encountered in using professional organization guidelines for the preparation of teachers and specialized school personnel?

8. To what extent do the standards encourage innovation and experimentation in program development?

9. Do the proposed standards succeed in "stretching" the institutions?

10. To what extent are the problems encountered related to the type of institution, scope of programs offered, and/or the format and requirements of the proposed standards?

11. Without sacrificing the level of quality sought in the standards, what modifications in the proposed standards might help to solve or minimize the difficulties met by the institutions?

From the standpoint of the experience of NCATE, answers were sought to such questions as:

1. What special difficulties confront the visiting teams on campus as they verify the institutional reports, collect supplementary information, and make judgments about the quality of the programs?

2. Does the preparation of the team report require a reasonable amount of time and effort?

3. What problems are encountered by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee as it performs its responsibilities for making detailed case studies and recommendations on accreditability for each of the pilot institutions?

4. What difficulties are experienced by the NCATE in arriving at a decision on the accreditability of each of the participating institutions?

5. Is the evidence produced by the institutions in their reports and that produced by the visiting teams in their reports the kind that is needed by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee and the Council in reaching decisions on accreditability?

6. Does the comprehensiveness of the proposed standards make the job of evaluation manageable?

7. Does the amount of specificity in the new standards create any particular problems?

8. What problems are encountered in using professional organization guidelines for the preparation of teachers and specialized school personnel?

9. What difficulties are faced in evaluating the graduates of the institutions?

10. Do the proposed standards "stretch" the institutions?

11. To what extent do the problems faced by the NCATE visiting teams, the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, and the Council appear to be related to the type of institution under consideration, the previous accreditation status of the institution, the scope of programs offered, and/or the format and requirements of the proposed standards?

12. Without sacrificing the level of quality sought in the standards, what modifications of the proposed standards might help to remedy the difficulties faced by NCATE?

The answers to these questions and others suggested to the committee how the proposed standards should be revised in light of actual usage.

Project Activities

The major activities of the Feasibility Project are described below.

1. Selection of the participating institutions. Eight institutions, jointly selected by AACTE and NCATE, were chosen on the basis of several criteria: expressed intent to seek initial accreditation or reaccreditation by NCATE during 1969 or 1970, type of institution, scope of programs offered, location by regional accrediting area, and present accreditation status. The following colleges and universities, broadly representative of teacher-preparing institutions in the United States, were selected in early 1968: Bethany College, West Virginia; Elmhurst College, Illinois; Moorhead State College, Minnesota; Sam Houston State College, Huntsville, Texas; San Francisco State College, California; the University of Detroit, Michigan; the University of Georgia, Athens; and the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

2. Orientation of representatives from the pilot institutions. During April 1968, orientation meetings for representatives of the eight participating institutions were held in Dallas and Chicago, at which the proposed new standards were interpreted and the purposes and procedures of the project explained.

3. Preparation of institutional reports. Between April and December 1968, the pilot institutions conducted self-studies and prepared their respective reports based on the proposed new standards. Pursuant to the requirements of

the standards, each report included answers to specific questions designed to elicit evidence that showed to what extent the standards were met by the institution.

4. Selection of personnel for the Visitation and Appraisal Committee and the visiting teams. During the summer months of 1968, NCATE and AACTE staff identified potential personnel to serve on the special Visitation and Appraisal Committee and on the eight visiting teams. Approximately one-half of the membership of the visiting teams was composed of persons with previous NCATE experience, and as is normally the case, each institution had the option of accepting or rejecting the names of any persons proposed to serve on its visiting team.

5. Mid-project visits by staff. During September and October 1968, project staff visited with more than one hundred individuals at the institutions to discover what, if any, problems they were encountering at that stage of preparation of their reports. Although it was too soon to reach firm conclusions about the experiences of the institutions, early assessment revealed:

   (a) There was general, and in some cases enthusiastic, support for the proposed standards. There was little demand for substantive changes in the preambles, standards, or questions.

   (b) It was apparent that the standards "stretched" the institutions. Many of those interviewed said in effect, "We are hard pressed to answer a number of the questions following the standards, but these are precisely the kinds of questions we should be answering."

   (c) It appeared that the standards permitted considerable latitude in how institutions design and conduct teacher education programs. This is in keeping with the intent of the new standards that they should be reasonably flexible.

   (d) That the institutions are having some problems in using the new standards was also apparent. It appeared that many of these difficulties could be alleviated through modifications in the procedures used in conducting self-studies and writing reports and/or through minor revisions of the standards.

6. Orientation of the visiting teams. In December 1968, the team members met for an orientation session with the project staff and representatives from the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, at which the proposed standards were discussed, project objectives and procedures explained, and the role of the visiting team interpreted.

7. On-site visits by the visiting teams. During January and February 1969, a team of evaluators visited each of the pilot institutions. For the pilot tests, the role of the visiting team was expanded to include a judgment-making function, in addition to the usual assignments of verifying and supplementing the institutional report. This change in procedures, mutually agreed upon by NCATE and the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, concurred with the recommendations of a number of experienced team chairmen and institutional representatives who had submitted their reactions to the proposed standards. Furthermore, it was in line with earlier discussions of the NCATE Council concerning possible revisions in the role of the team.

Under the existing procedures, judgment making was primarily the responsibility of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee and the Council. The team described the institution's program, verified the information in the institution's report, and supplemented the report as necessary. As a rule, it did not make judgments about the program; it was not requested to do so.

Because certain characteristics of a teacher education program can be best evaluated through an on-site visit, the teams visiting the pilot institutions were requested to make and report their judgments with supporting evidence about selected aspects of the programs evaluated. The Visitation and Appraisal Committee and the Council thus had additional information and evidence available about the respective participating institutions in performing their assignments.

Before a team visited its assigned institution, each member studied the institution's report and submitted to his chairman a brief analytical statement noting the major strengths and weaknesses of the program as he saw them, identifying those parts of the report that needed validation, and indicating what he thought the team should look for during the early part of its visit. On the basis of these analytical statements from his team members, the chairman prepared for and conducted a preliminary visit at the institution before the visit by the team. The purposes of this preliminary visit were to arrange a schedule of activities for the visit, alert the institution to the major areas of concern as expressed by the team members, and to begin the task of validating the institution's report.

On the basis of the preliminary analysis by the chairman, the team then completed the task of validating the institution's report, discussed and evaluated the teacher education program of the institution, and prepared the major parts of its report.

At the conclusion of each of the eight visits, members of the staff and representatives from the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee and NCATE met with the team to review its experience in the performance of its assigned task. On the day following the visit, key personnel at the institution were interviewed to review their experience in using the proposed standards and in being visited by the team.

8. Orientation of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee. A special nine-member committee was constituted to consider the eight pilot cases, one-half of whom had experience serving on NCATE Visitation and Appraisal Committees. One member of the committee was a member of the Council. In March 1969, this special Visitation and Appraisal Committee was oriented concerning the proposed new standards, the objectives and procedures of the project, and its assignment.

9. Meeting of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee. During the month between the orientation session and the meeting of the committee, members analyzed the reports of the eight pilot institutions and the eight visiting teams. In April 1969, the committee met to make a detailed case study of each institution and formulated its recommendations to the Council regarding the accreditability of each of the participating colleges and universities. In reaching its decision on an individual case, the committee considered the evidence presented in the reports of the institution and visiting team, as well as that presented by institutional representatives attending the scheduled hearings. The recommendations, with supporting evidence, were submitted to the Council in May by the chairman of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee.

   At the conclusion of the meeting, members of the staff and representatives from the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee met with the group to review its experience in evaluating the teacher education programs of the pilot institutions on the basis of the proposed new standards.

10. Meeting of the Council. The Council as then constituted was oriented in May 1969 concerning the proposed new standards, project objectives and procedures, and its assignment. It heard the report of the chairman of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, considered the committee's recommendations, and made a decision on the accreditability of each institution. The staff, representatives from the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, five consultants, and representatives from the

AACTE Executive Committee were present to observe the Council in action on the eight cases.

11. Final evaluation meeting. Immediately following the meeting of the Council, a final evaluation session was held to

    (a) review and analyze the problems encountered by the pilot institutions and the accrediting agency in using the proposed new standards,

    (b) determine how the proposed standards might be modified to alleviate such difficulties, and

    (c) propose changes in the accrediting process that might minimize the problems encountered. Participants in this final evaluation session included the members of the Council, representatives from the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, the chairmen of the eight visiting teams, members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, representatives from the AACTE Executive Committee, the project staff, and five consultants[7].

Final Revision

During the summer and early fall of 1969, the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee revised the proposed new standards on the basis of the results of the eight tests, the findings of an analysis of the standards by a systems analyst[8], and the reactions to the proposals from individuals and groups that were received between May 1968 and May 1969. The major findings of the Feasibility Project are reported below.

FINDINGS OF THE FEASIBILITY PROJECT

The results that are reported in this section are based on the responses of

- The 125 institutional representatives of the eight participating colleges and universities who were interviewed during the mid-project visits.
- The 208 institutional representatives who completed an evaluation instrument (see Appendix F) after the institutional reports were completed.
- The 80 visiting team members who completed an evaluation instrument (see Appendix G) after the institutional visits were completed.
- The visiting team members and key institutional personnel who participated in post-visit evaluation sessions which were tape-recorded (30-plus hours).
- Nine Visitation and Appraisal Committee members who participated in the post-meeting evaluation session.
- The 50 persons who participated in a final one-day evaluation session following the meeting of NCATE in May 1969. This group was composed of Council members; visiting team chairmen; members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee; representatives of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee, the AACTE Executive Committee; five consultants; and the project staff.

Project findings are reported in two categories: those treating the standards and those dealing with the process of applying the standards.

Project Findings and the Standards

1. Clarity. Generally speaking, most of the standards in Part I and Part II appeared to be reasonably clear to both institutional personnel and visiting team members.

In the four tables, pages 15 to 18, every standard in Part I and II received more "clear" votes than "unclear" votes by both institutional personnel and visiting team members. Most standards received considerably more "clear" votes than "unclear" votes. The standards in Part II appear to be understood better than those in Part I, but it should be noted in analyzing the responses that only six of the eight institutions were involved in testing the standards in Part II. (See columns 4 and 5 in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4).

In Part I, the standards which were least clear to institutional representatives were those in the program of instruction section--excluding 1.7 and 1.9 -- and 2.5 (Faculty Involvement with Schools).

For visiting team members, those creating the greatest difficulty were 1.4 (Humanistic and Behavioral Studies) in the professional studies component and the three standards in the evaluation section.

In Part II, institutional representatives had the most difficulty in understanding G-4.3 (Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources), while visiting team members experienced the greatest difficulty with G-5.1 and G-5.2 in the evaluation section.

Other responses from institutional personnel and visiting team members indicated further that there is some ambiguity in the standards. One team chairman noted that the relationship between preambles, standards and questions is unclear. Representatives from one institution observed that the standards do not always "reflect the lofty purpose of the preambles."

In addition to those standards already mentioned, 3.2 (Use of National Norms) was cited as unclear. Some respondents identified specific questions that presented problems with respect to clarity. These included 1.79, 1.84, 1.92, 2.11, 2.52, 2.53, and G-1.84.

2. Flexibility. With few exceptions, there was substantial support from both institutional personnel and visiting team members for the conclusion that the standards are appropriately flexible.

The responses to the items in the charts indicate that all standards in both Parts I and II were considered by both institutional representatives and visiting team members to be "appropriately flexible." In all but a few cases, the support registered was substantial ranging from about 5 to 1 to about 40 to 1. (See columns 9, 10, and 11 in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.)

Additional support was registered by groups of institutional representatives, by individuals, and by visiting teams during the post-visit evaluation sessions. One group of institutional representatives noted that the standards "permit the institution to make a creative analysis of its program." Further support was given to the "appropriate flexibility" of the standards by chief institutional representatives of three schools in their responses to the open-ended questions in the written evaluative instruments.

Evidence presented in the four tables, from the responses to other items in the written evaluative instruments, and from the post-visit evaluation sessions indicates that certain standards were considered "too restrictive" by some respondents. Those mentioned most frequently were: 1.4 Humanistic and Behavioral Studies, 3.2 Use of National Norms, and 3.3 Academic Screening.

The standards on admission were considered by one institution as having a middle-class bias. One institutional representative believe that the standards have a bias against the liberal arts. The use of national norms was challenged by some on philosophical grounds.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 8 PILOT INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING PART I-BASIC PROGRAMS OF THE PROPOSED NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

(Table 1)

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value	
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
General Studies	1.1	47	11	5	23	28	5	1	44	3	26	4
Prof. Studies	1.2	45	11	4	22	25	2	1	45	1	27	5
Teaching Specialty	1.3	52	11	5	23	26	11	4	47	3	35	1
H&B Studies	1.4	33	12	5	18	21	4	10	33	1	25	7
Theory & Lab.	1.5	41	8	5	13	30	4	1	39	4	30	6
Theory & Clinical	1.6	36	9	7	14	21	7	2	34	4	28	2
Practicum	1.7	45	4	4	15	23	7	4	38	1	34	3
Research & Dev.	1.8	28	15	0	10	18	11	3	32	2	16	11
Control	1.9	41	5	2	25	17	1	5	34	3	25	3
Faculty	2.1	42	3	1	22	17	3	4	30	3	26	3
Quality	2.2	39	7	0	19	18	5	4	30	3	23	4
Load	2.3	40	3	1	18	16	7	1	32	5	26	2
Assignment	2.4	38	4	3	18	12	6	0	31	4	13	8
Prof. Involvement	2.5	45	4	6	18	16	10	2	36	2	23	3
Stud. Admissions	3.1	42	5	0	21	18	6	6	36	0	26	6
Norms	3.2	38	12	0	16	18	14	19	25	1	17	14
Acad. Screening	3.3	48	10	0	21	24	3	9	33	2	21	12
Personal Traits	3.4	38	9	1	14	14	15	5	29	7	21	8
Advisement	3.5	42	4	1	13	22	5	2	37	2	23	5
Stud. Involvement	3.6	41	4	0	9	19	12	1	37	2	22	8
Library	4.1	40	2	2	25	14	2	2	32	3	27	4
Instruct. Media	4.2	39	3	1	22	19	2	3	38	4	26	5
Facilities	4.3	39	4	1	24	15	2	1	37	3	22	7
Support	4.4	36	7	1	24	13	4	2	33	5	21	5
Aux. Services	4.5	41	2	1	36	14	1	1	34	5	22	4
Quality of Prod.	5.1	37	7	1	11	13	21	2	32	3	25	4
Eval. & Follow-up	5.2	35	7	1	9	10	23	1	33	2	17	3
Long Range Plans	5.3	33	9	1	12	15	16	2	32	3	21	4

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF 6 PILOT INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING PART II-ADVANCED PROGRAMS OF THE PROPOSED NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

(Table 2)

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value	
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Purpose of Prog.	G 1.1	39	5	0	20	17	4	5	35	1	20	5
Content of Prog.	G 1.2	34	8	2	20	16	6	4	32	2	24	3
Practicum	G 1.3	36	6	2	17	14	11	6	23	3	19	5
Research	G 1.4	31	8	2	17	18	3	4	31	1	21	7
Prog. Individualization	G 1.5	41	1	0	25	14	5	1	35	1	15	1
Credit	G 1.6	38	3	1	27	18	2	2	36	0	20	9
Courses	G 1.7	40	2	0	28	16	2	4	32	1	25	3
Residency	G 1.8	43	0	0	28	8	6	8	34	0	18	9
Control	G 1.9	42	0	0	29	15	1	0	39	0	28	0
Faculty	G 2.1	41	3	0	25	9	4	7	33	1	30	1
Quality	G 2.2	40	2	0	34	12	0	7	30	2	25	2
Size	G 2.3	34	6	0	27	11	2	5	32	1	21	5
Assignment	G 2.4	36	4	0	25	10	2	3	32	1	18	9
Load	G 2.5	40	1	1	23	13	5	3	33	4	24	5
Research Invol.	G 2.6	36	4	2	19	17	4	4	30	5	21	5
Grad. Admissions	G 3.1	43	1	1	19	16	7	3	39	1	29	5
Screening	G 3.2	40	2	0	18	17	9	3	33	1	21	4
Supervision	G 3.3	40	2	0	25	12	2	0	36	0	24	2
Quality	G 3.4	39	3	0	17	18	10	3	34	2	25	3
Student Involvement	G 3.5	41	2	2	12	14	9	2	34	0	22	6
Library	G 4.1	41	2	1	25	9	7	3	37	2	28	4
Facilities	G 4.2	37	5	1	19	11	7	0	32	2	21	7
Resources	G 4.3	29	6	6	22	8	9	1	39	5	19	7
Support	G 4.4	35	4	1	24	8	5	1	38	8	19	6
Research	G 4.5	37	1	1	23	13	3	0	32	3	21	5
Evaluation	G 5.1	37	5	1	16	11	14	2	36	1	27	2
Improvement	G 5.2	37	4	1	16	11	12	3	33	0	17	4
Long Range Plans	G 5.3	36	3	0	15	14	9	2	33	3	21	4

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF THE 8 VISITING TEAMS CONCERNING PART I-BASIC PROGRAMS OF THE PROPOSED NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

(Table 3)

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value	
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
General Studies	1.1	37	4	2	17	15	5	2	31	3	25	5
Prof. Studies	1.2	30	8	1	18	13	5	1	33	3	28	2
Teaching Specialty	1.3	28	4	1	17	13	4	3	29	2	28	2
H&B Studies	1.4	21	7	6	10	13	9	3	23	3	16	8
Theory & Lab.	1.5	28	11	0	16	15	7	1	31	2	29	2
Theory & Clinical	1.6	22	11	2	11	15	6	0	30	2	26	3
Practicum	1.7	31	4	1	17	13	5	1	32	2	32	0
Research & Dev.	1.8	26	9	2	12	14	9	2	29	2	23	10
Control	1.9	27	6	4	12	11	11	3	26	1	25	4
Faculty	2.1	29	4	1	12	11	6	0	27	3	24	3
Quality	2.2	27	5	1	9	17	5	1	23	5	26	0
Load	2.3	28	4	0	8	13	8	0	27	2	28	1
Assignment	2.4	26	6	0	10	15	5	1	28	1	24	3
Prof. Involvement	2.5	27	4	1	10	15	4	0	25	2	19	9
Stud. Admissions	3.1	26	3	0	7	13	6	0	27	0	23	2
Norms	3.2	26	4	1	2	14	9	5	21	0	15	8
Acad. Screening	3.3	27	4	0	5	13	9	0	28	0	24	2
Personal Traits	3.4	17	11	1	4	7	15	1	23	3	14	8
Advisement	3.5	28	2	1	8	15	4	0	26	0	20	4
Stud. Involvement	3.6	26	6	0	9	13	6	1	26	1	18	4
Library	4.1	31	1	0	14	14	1	0	27	0	24	2
Instruct. Media	4.2	26	5	3	13	11	1	1	23	0	22	1
Facilities	4.3	28	4	2	11	13	1	0	22	2	20	3
Support	4.4	29	1	0	12	12	2	0	23	1	17	6
Aux. Services	4.5	25	2	1	12	12	1	0	22	2	21	2
Quality of Prod.	5.1	20	10	6	7	8	17	0	21	4	22	7
Eval. & Follow-up	5.2	19	8	8	6	9	19	0	21	6	19	9
Long Range Plans	5.3	20	8	7	6	10	16	1	23	2	19	7

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF THE 6 VISITING TEAMS
CONCERNING PART II--ADVANCED PROGRAMS OF THE PROPOSED NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

(Table 4)

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value	
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Purpose of Prog.	G 1.1	22	7	0	15	8	5	1	27	4	22	6
Content of Prog.	G 1.2	24	7	0	14	11	4	0	30	2	24	2
Practicum	G 1.3	22	8	0	7	14	7	1	23	2	19	4
Research	G 1.4	25	3	1	9	13	8	0	33	2	27	3
Prog. Individualization	G 1.5	28	1	0	11	13	3	0	24	1	20	2
Credit	G 1.6	25	4	0	10	14	1	0	26	0	25	4
Courses	G 1.7	29	0	1	11	11	3	0	24	1	16	2
Residency	G 1.8	25	4	0	8	11	5	2	20	2	16	3
Control	G 1.9	25	3	1	11	11	5	1	24	1	18	1
Faculty	G 2.1	24	2	2	9	10	5	0	23	1	21	0
Quality	G 2.2	21	4	2	8	11	7	1	21	2	19	2
Size	G 2.3	22	3	2	9	11	3	1	22	0	19	1
Assignment	G 2.4	23	1	2	6	11	4	0	21	0	19	2
Load	G 2.5	20	5	2	9	8	6	0	22	0	18	6
Research Invol.	G 2.6	14	9	3	4	11	7	1	16	2	15	5
Grad. Admissions	G 3.1	24	5	0	8	8	8	2	23	0	22	1
Screening	G 3.2	23	6	0	5	11	7	0	22	2	19	1
Supervision	G 3.3	28	1	0	7	13	4	1	24	0	19	1
Quality	G 3.4	22	7	0	6	12	5	0	24	0	18	2
Student Involvement	G 3.5	20	4	0	6	6	8	1	22	0	16	2
Library	G 4.1	16	1	0	6	11	3	0	19	2	18	1
Facilities	G 4.2	15	1	1	7	12	2	0	20	1	17	0
Resources	G 4.3	16	1	1	5	11	4	0	20	0	18	0
Support	G 4.4	15	1	0	7	10	2	0	18	0	15	1
Research	G 4.5	15	2	1	4	12	5	1	21	0	16	2
Evaluation	G 5.1	14	5	5	3	5	15	1	17	4	18	4
Improvement	G 5.2	16	5	4	3	6	13	1	16	3	16	4
Long Range Plans	G 5.3	19	1	4	4	7	9	1	15	3	14	4

Evidence shows that the following standards were considered, by some, as "not restrictive enough": 5.1 Evaluation of Graduates, 5.2 Use of Evaluation Results, G-4.4 Clerical and Other Supporting Services, G-5.1 Evaluation of Graduates, G-5.2 Use of Evaluation Results, and G-5.3 Long-Range Planning.

The standards on the evaluation of graduates and the use of evaluation results were noted as being "appropriately flexible," especially by visiting team members.

3. Specificity. Although team members and institutional personnel expressed a number of concerns regarding this characteristic of the new standards, the increased amount of specificity appeared to enjoy wide support.

In several cases, visiting teams reported that the institutional reports were more informative and useful than those produced using the former standards. There was, according to some team members and institutional personnel, less opportunity for verbosity, for "guilding the lilly."

Visiting team members at two institutions reported that the specificity in the standards was helpful in the preparation of their preliminary analyses.

There is evidence that a number of team members and institutional personnel found the standards, in some respects, too specific. In several cases, team members observed that the large number of standards and/or questions resulted in institutional reports that were excessively fragmented. This fragmentation, they reported, complicated the task of arriving at a Gestalt with respect to an institution's teacher education program.

Several team members, as well as a few institutional representatives, thought that the standards asked for more detail than was necessary for ascertaining accreditability. Reactions from post-visit evaluation sessions included several suggestions that the number of standards and/or questions be "judiciously pared down."

4. Comprehensiveness. Evidence supports the conclusion that the standards were appropriately comprehensive.

During the mid-project visits, institutional representatives were questioned regarding the comprehensiveness of the proposed new standards. While most respondents offered no suggestions for specific standards to be added or deleted, a number expressed concerns which were classified either as "omissions" or as "too much comprehensiveness." These concerns persisted throughout the Project.

The most frequently mentioned omissions were:

- A true picture of the "personality of the institution" (called "flavor of the institution" by others) was not revealed in a written report based on the questions in the standards. It was noted by some that it may not be possible to remedy this situation in the standards themselves. One of the major tasks of the visiting team is to search out those intangible ingredients which make up the personality of the institution. Respondents from seven of the eight schools mentioned that an introductory section to the report would give the institution an opportunity to provide a contextual setting for their teacher education programs.

- Some of the visiting teams noted that information about the organization and administration of the teacher education program was not included in the institutional report. It was suggested that such information is needed by the team, but noted that it was not necessary to establish standards to provide such data.

- A number of institutional representatives and visiting team members expressed concern that the standards did not call for a statement of philosophy and objectives by the institution. Particular reference was made to the new standards on evaluation of the graduates. It was noted that an evaluation of the graduates must necessarily begin with objectives. The concerns in this area did not suggest that there should be standards on objectives, but that such information is needed by the visiting teams for making their evaluations.

- Even though institutions are invited in the introductory section of the standards to make "additions" in their reports where appropriate under the various standards, many respondents believed that it was not possible to describe adequately innovative and experimental programs. In this connection, it was clear that 1.84 needed further study.

With respect to the over-comprehensiveness of the standards, the most frequently mentioned concerns were:

- "Is this much minutiae necessary to do the job?" This criticism was directed more frequently to the number of questions following the standards than to the number of standards. One team chairman noted that the format of the standards emphasizes the inconsequential.

- The amount of duplication among some of the standards and questions was mentioned by some as unnecessary. The fact that there is a separate set of standards for graduate programs results in some duplication between the faculty and resources sections of Parts I and II. Specific problems with duplication were identified and were available for study by the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee.

Of special interest was the favorable reaction to the fact that there were separate standards for advanced programs. Representatives from several of the institutions offering graduate programs indicated the desirability of separate standards even though their programs were examined with greater scrutiny than was the case under the former standards. Experienced visiting team members reported generally that they could evaluate graduate programs more effectively with separate standards.

5. Conceptualization. The findings of the project indicated that the personnel using the standards (a) had no serious problems in conceptualizing the various characteristics which relate to accreditation, namely, instructional program, faculty, students, resources, and evaluation; (b) had some serious difficulties in conceptualizing individual programs, particularly at the graduate level; and (c) had no serious problems in conceptualizing the quality of various levels of work, as for example, undergraduate, master's, specialist's, and doctoral.

An analysis of the responses to the questions about conceptualization is complicated by the fact that some respondents answered the questions only in terms of the particular standards assigned to them for preparing the institutional report or the visiting team report. Therefore, the opinions of the chief institutional representatives and the visiting team chairmen were analyzed separately since their assignments involved a consideration of the standards as a whole.

Following is a summmary of the responses of all institutional representatives (IR) and visiting team members (VTM) to the question (see items #1 and #2, Appendixes F and G):

> "To what extent do the 28 standards as grouped in the five sections of Part I (program, faculty, students, resources and evaluation) enable you to conceptualize what constitutes acceptable quality with respect to basic programs? Point out those sections or areas where you feel there are deficiencies or omissions." (Another question was included for Part II -- advanced programs):

Response	Part I		Part II	
	IR	VTM	IR	VTM
"No problems"	35	24	19	14
"No problems if ..."	18	16	11	15
"Definite problems"	11	8	3	5
"Not possible"	5	4	2	1

A summary of the responses of the chief institutional representatives (CIR) and the visiting team chairmen (VTC) follows:

Response	Part I		Part II	
	CIR	VTC	CIR	VTC
"No problems"	1	3	2	2
"No problems if ..."	7	2	2	2
"Definite problems"	3	1	4	1
"Not possible"	1	2	1	1

Comments from the eight team chairmen:

- "Far superior to old standards; helpful in arriving at a sense of quality."
- "No problems in total overview. Conceptualization quite easy. Length and amount of detail seems overwhelming."
- "About as good as can be done."
- "Conceptualization could have occurred if the institution's report had been more adequate. Additional guidance for team members needed. Standards ask for the needed information. Conceptualization may be more easily obtained through experience with the standards."
- "Section I on program needs further breakdown to enable institutions to respond more fully."
- "A weighting of sections I to IV is all-important."
- "Standards do not suggest amount or extent of various elements needed to indicate quality programs."
- "Disagrees with the concept of establishing acceptable quality on the specific standards as delineated. Philosophically unsound."

Listed below are problems mentioned most frequently with respect to conceptualizing the wholes:

- "Too much fragmentation creates problems in structuring the whole"; "difficult to put the small pieces together to determine quality"; "institutional report is one of analysis rather than synthesis."

- Inexperience in using the new standards.

- Inadequate institutional reports.

- "What is acceptable quality?"

- Standards seem to over-emphasize "cold data", fail to consider special qualities of faculty and students.

- "Breakdown of team assignments made it difficult to conceptualize the whole."

- "Perhaps there is too much flexibility in the standards."

- Duplication within the institutional report.

- The standards are organized horizontally (program, faculty, students, resources, evaluation) which makes conceptualization on a vertical basis difficult (elementary program, secondary program, guidance and counseling, administration, etc.).

The following suggestions were made to make the task of conceptualization less difficult:

- Ask the institution to include an introduction in its report in which it would present the contextual setting of its programs.

- Give the institution more instructions in preparing its report.

- Provide more opportunity to the institution to report about its unique programs.

- Request the institution to prepare summary statements at the end of the sections and/or at the end of Part I and II.

- Insist that the institution give the rationale for its various programs.

- Visiting teams need experience in arranging their schedules during the visit so that their activities will contribute maximally to the task of conceptualizing the wholes.

The following comments elaborate on certain factors related to the task of conceptualization:

- Adequate conceptualization of the quality of institutional characteristics, individual programs, and levels of work requires an on-site visit in addition to a written report from the institution.

- The preliminary analysis of the institutional report and the preliminary visit by the team chairman appeared to be useful procedures in assisting the team to conceptualize the whole.

6. Pay-off Value. Nearly all of the standards in both Parts I and II were considered to have high pay-off value by both institutional representatives and visiting team members.

During the mid-project visits, there were few responses to the question, "Which standards have the highest (lowest) pay-off value?" Respondents who were concerned about the over-comprehensiveness of the standards seldom offered suggestions as to which ones should be dropped.

Responses to the written evaluative instrument gave some clues as to which standards may have the greatest relevance for accreditation purposes (see columns 12 and 13 in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4). The following standards were questioned most frequently regarding their pay-off value:

By institutional representatives

1.8 Research and Development
3.2 National Norms
3.3 Academic Screening
3.4 Personal Traits
3.6 Student Involvement
G-1.6 Graduate Credit
G-1.8 Residency

By visiting team members

1.4 Humanistic and Behavioral Studies
1.8 Research and Development
2.5 Professional Involvement of Faculty
3.2 National Norms
3.4 Personal Traits
5.1 Quality of Product
5.2 Evaluation and Follow-up

7. Use of Professional Organization Guidelines. There was general support for the principle embodied in the provision regarding the use of professional organization guidelines.

Both institutional personnel and team members expressed support for the idea of utilizing the competencies of professional organizations for the improvement of teacher education programs. One institution reported that this provision in the standards contributed to the improvement of communication between education and other academic departments. One visiting team suggested that academic departments might be stimulated to become more involved in the preparation of teachers.

Oral and written responses regarding this provision indicated that many team members and institutional personnel were concerned that the professional organization guidelines might be interpreted as standards and that full compliance would become mandatory. It was suggested that references to these guidelines in the standards should be revised to assure institutions that compliance is not required, that institutions should present evidence that they have critically examined these criteria and that they have given them due consideration in developing their programs for preparing teachers.

It was clear that considerable study and direction was needed to facilitate the effective implementation of the provision regarding the use of professional organization guidelines. Other related problems were lack of lead time, lack of clarity, identification of available guidelines, and the nature of some of the guidelines.

8. Evaluation of Graduates. There was general and enthusiastic support for the standards on evaluating graduates.

Visiting team members and institutional personnel expressed almost unanimous support for the principle of evaluating graduates as an essential criterion in the evaluation of teacher education programs. Support for the standards in sections 5 and G-5 was reflected in the high pay-off value assigned to these items by respondents in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. Team members and institutional personnel observed that these standards have significant potential in terms of stimulating improvement in teacher education programs. The inclusion of these standards was frequently cited as one of the most encouraging features of the new standards.

Due to the "primitive state of assessment making", both institutional personnel and visiting team members experienced much difficulty with the standards on evaluation of graduates. Problems related to data availability are discussed elsewhere in this Report. It was pointed out by some that the standards did not ask for objectives -- a necessary ingredient for effective product evaluation. Evidence indicated that the standards in this section needed further clarification with respect to assessments at the terminal point of programs and to those made after graduates are on the job.

The urgent need for research in the area of assessing the quality of graduates was emphasized by visiting team members and institutional personnel. Repeatedly, it was pointed out that AACTE and NCATE must play a significant role in attacking this problem. There was general agreement that the evaluation of preparation programs would become less important as more reliable measures of product assessment are developed.

9. General Conclusions.

- The composite general reaction of institutional representatives and visiting team members to the new standards and their workability was positive.

- Of the new elements incorporated in the standards, the evaluation of graduates was enthusiastically supported, the use of professional organization guidelines was generally supported, and all but one institution supported the provision for student involvement.

- On the whole, the format of the new standards was useful and helpful to institutions and visiting teams. In several instances there were problems with respect to the relation of the preambles and questions to the standards.

- The separate set of standards for advanced programs appeared to be effective in highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of graduate programs.

Project Findings and the Process of Applying the Standards

While the major purpose of the project was to test the workability of the proposed new standards, it was evident from the beginning that the process of applying the standards was also being tested. Plans were made, therefore, to evaluate the effectiveness of the process. The results of this evaluation are summarized below.

1. Institutional Readiness

- It was suggested that a representative from an institution seeking initial accreditation should serve as an observer on an NCATE visit for orientation at institutional expense.

- There were requests for assistance in conducting the institutional self-study: self-study guidelines, consultative service.

- The orientation meeting for institutional representatives was viewed as an important and necessary step in the project.

2. Preparation of the Institutional Report

- Some directions to the institution for preparing the report should be prepared. Such directions should include suggestions for collecting data about faculty and students.

- Some of the pilot institutions found it useful to include introductory statements in their reports. For the project, the preparation of an introduction to the institutional report was optional. The visiting teams and the Visitation and Appraisal Committee considered only part of the material in the introductions useful for their purposes.

- Problems faced by the institutions included: shortage of lead time, meaning of "evidence," how to organize effectively to conduct the self-study and write the report, the use of the quantitative data summary report, and duplication of effort.

3. Adequacy of Institutional Reports

- The institutional reports prepared on the basis of the proposed new standards varied widely as to their adequacy for use by visiting teams. One report was considered outstanding by the visiting team; the remainder were regarded partially adequate to adequate.

- The shortage of lead time for the institutions was definitely a factor in the kind of reports prepared. One institution prepared a supplement to its report because it felt obligated to submit its incomplete report to meet the deadline date.

- The preliminary analysis of the institutional report by the visiting team members led to requests for additional information not included in the report. Almost without exception this procedure resulted in valuable information for the team.

- The use of the QDS (Quantitative Data Summary) now used by NCATE needs further study as it relates to the new standards. Some essential information prepared uniformly is useful for the accrediting agency. It was suggested that such data might be computerized for a central data bank in the headquarters office for research purposes.

- In the section on "comprehensiveness," reference is made to the concerns of the institutional representatives and visiting team members regarding the reporting of innovative and experimental programs.

- There was substantial support from both institutional representatives and visiting team members for including in the standards a set of instructions for preparing institutional reports. It is believed that such instructions should be minimal and non-interpretative in nature.

It seemed reasonable to assume that more adequate institutional reports would result with certain modifications in procedure, and perhaps in the standards themselves. It was also noted that additional experience in using the standards should lead to an improvement of the operation.

4. Data Availability

- With the exception of evidence concerning the quality of graduates, data were generally available and accessible for the preparation of institutional and visiting team reports.

- Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 indicate that for all but 8 items, a majority of respondents had "no problems" or "no serious problems" with respect to data availability. Six of the eight exceptions are related to evaluating the quality of graduates. The other two exceptions show that visiting teams identified standard 3.4 (Screening on the Basic of Personal Characterisitics) and standard G-3.1 (Admission to Advanced Programs) as posing definite problems. Evidence indicated that a considerable number of team members and institutional personnel had definite data availability problems with some of the other standards including: 1.9 Control of the Program, 2.5 Faculty Involvement with Schools, 3.2 Use of National Norms, 3.6 Student Involvement in the Teacher Education Program, and G-3.5 Student Involvement in Graduate Programs in Education. It should be noted that 1.9

was a source of difficulty for visiting teams only. Problems with respect to this standard were not reflected in the responses of institutional personnel.

- In some instances, both institutional personnel and team members noted that data needed for a particular standard, while available, was difficult to retrieve. Three institutions cited inadequate record-keeping facilities as a casual factor. The lack of a central "data bank" was cited on several occasions. At least four of the institutions stated that they are formulating plans making such data more accessible and for gathering heretofore unavailable data that is deemed important.

- It was clear that the difficulty of obtaining evidence for evaluating graduates is attributable to the anticipatory nature of the standard. In spite of "the primitive state of the art" with respect to product evaluation, this provision received enthusiastic support from visiting team members and institutional personnel. Participants in the oral and written evaluation activities agreed that this standard would become increasingly significant as more effective evaluation instruments are developed. It should be noted, however, that a number of respondents suggested that the standard be revised to include a statement of objectives which would serve as a basis for assessing data and evidence regarding product evaluation.

5. Role of the Visiting Team

- The orientation meeting for team members was viewed as an important and necessary step in the project.

- The training of team members was stressed as an important step in the accreditation operation (noted by visiting team members and the Visitation and Appraisal Committee).

- There was strong support across the board for three new procedures that visiting teams were requested to include in their work: a preliminary analysis of the institutional report with results mailed to the team chairman in advance of his visit; a preliminary visit to the campus by the team chairman to set the stage, make advance plans for the visit, and identify areas to which the team would want to give special attention; and the making and reporting of judgments by the team.

- The team visit serves a unique function in the accreditation process. It can discover the "personality" of the institution: its climate, faculty morale, student morale; it can make other judgments which can not be reached by just reading the institutional report. It can discover other pertinent data which the institution may have overlooked.

- Some problems were encountered by the teams. The task of verifying information contained in the institutional report was too time-consuming. The teams needed more time together to "grind out" their judgments. The teams should have had more group meetings with departments, students, and faculty as a basis for verifying the institutional reports and for judgment-making.

6. The Visitation and Appraisal Committee Meeting

- There was unanimous agreement that the new standards were discriminating, that is, the eight pilot institutions could be differentiated according to the quality of their teacher education programs.

- Some Visitation and Appraisal members indicated that the assigned task was unmanageable if the committee is expected to operate as it does presently. There was discussion regarding the need to change the role of Visitation and Appraisal Committees in the future.

- The members recognized that the institutional reports generally contained more pertinent information than was the case with reports written under the former standards.

- The members were appreciative of the special efforts made by the visiting teams to include judgments in their reports. However, it was noted that team reports need to be written in such a way that the judgments are explicit and supported with appropriate evidence.

- In one case, some of the team's major judgments were seriously challenged by the remarks of institutional representatives who were present to be interviewed by the Visitation and Appraisal Committee. The impact of what was said by the institutional representatives probably tipped the balance in favor of a recommendation for accreditation. This raises two important questions: How much weight should team judgments be given? What procedure should be followed when there is a disagreement of this magnitude?

- There was general agreement that there should be a common format used in presenting the first and second reader reports. The format suggested (and used by two members) included an analysis sheet on which the member would rate the institution standard by standard.

7. The Council Meeting

- While the standards clearly discriminated among the eight institutions, they did not provide a cut-off line to separate those institutions which were accreditable from those which were not. It should be noted that it was not intended that the standards should do so.

- It was clear that the Council had some difficulty in handling the eight cases after having lifted provisional status from several "weak" institutions on the previous day. The context made it difficult to deny accreditation to any of the eight pilot cases.

8. Related Items

- As an "experiment within an experiment," two members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee served as individual evaluators at the University of Georgia concentrating on standards 1.4, and 1.5/1.6 respectively. It was concluded that it was possible to obtain the information essential to making judgments about 1.4 and 1.5/1.6 in a relatively short period of time (approximately 3 hours). Procedures included interviews with selected faculty members who had been identified in advance of the visits and who had ready for review certain specific materials also identified in advance.

- The question of the role of the NCATE central staff in the decision-making process was raised. In writing a report of the Visitation and Appraisal Committee's action for the Council, should the staff provide additional information which will help to present a more complete and accurate picture of the institution or should it provide no input?

- The Visitation and Appraisal Committee posed the question: Is the 10-year cycle of NCATE visits an appropriate one?

- There was strong support from a number of quarters suggesting that institutions should keep NCATE informed regarding the addition of programs.

MAJOR REVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED STANDARDS RESULTING FROM PROJECT FINDINGS

The pilot-testing of the proposed new standards was a fruitful venture; it was not a wheel-spinning operation. The tests were productive in identifying problem areas, finding solutions to some of the problems, and in providing experience in using the new standards. The major revisions of the proposed standards resulting from the findings of the pilot tests are summarized below.

1. Introductions were written for each section of the standards in both Parts I and II (curricula, faculty, students, resources, evaluation). These introductions emphasize the importance of interrelating the various aspects of teacher education programs.

2. The provision for operating and reporting on experimental programs was clarified.

3. The questions following each standard were analyzed and the preambles, standards and questions were revised so that

   a) unnecessary duplication was eliminated,
   b) "standard-like" ideas were incorporated in the preambles and standards, not in the questions,
   c) the requests for "evidence," "information" and/or "data" were clarified.

4. The number of standards and questions was reduced.

5. The place of objectives was clarified in a new standard on design of curricula in both Parts I and II (1.1, G-1.1) and in the standards on evaluating graduates (5.1, G-5.1).

6. The use of professional organization guidelines was raised from "footnote" status to full standard status (1.4, G-1.5).

7. The standard on the use of national norms was incorporated in the admission standards (3.1, G-3.1).

8. The standards on student involvement in program evaluation and development were strengthened (3.4, G-3.4).

9. In the standards for advanced programs, more provisions were made for differentiation of requirements for master's, sixth-year, and doctoral programs.

10. The standard on content for advanced curricula (G-1.2) was significantly revised to incorporate: content for the specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, theory relevant to the specialty with direct and simulated experiences in professional practice.

11. The standard on control of advanced programs (G-1.7) was revised to include the control of the quality of all courses, seminars, and workshops offered primarily at the convenience of school personnel in the field (such as at off-campus locations and at "irregular" hours) and counted as credit toward graduate degrees or certificates.

ADOPTION OF THE NEW STANDARDS AND NEXT STEPS

Following the revision of the proposed standards, the recommended new standards for teacher education were submitted to the AACTE Executive Committee for approval. Upon approval by this group on October 20, 1969, the new standards were transmitted to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education for action. AACTE published the standards under the title, Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, in November 1969 (see Appendix H) and distributed approximately 10,000 copies of this publication to colleges and universities, professional associations, state departments of education, and to representatives of the teaching profession. To assist individuals and groups to study these recommendations, an analysis of the differences between the former and the new standards was prepared (see Appendix I).

The recommended standards were adopted unanimously by NCATE at its January 1970 meeting in New Orleans and they are now the offical accreditation standards for teacher education. These standards become effective for all institutions seeking initial or reaccreditation by NCATE during the 1971-1972 school year. In the interim (1970-1971), institutions may elect to be evaluated on the basis of either the former or the new standards. Experience shows that many of these institutions are already electing the new standards as a basis for an evaluation by NCATE.

AACTE acknowledges that these new standards are not, and should not be, the final word in standards for accrediting teacher education. It recognizes that standards must be systematically reviewed and revised in terms of experience in using them, in light of societal changes, and in relation to advances in the state of the art of educating professional school personnel. The Association takes seriously its assigned responsibility and is committed to provide leadership for the continual evaluation and revision of these standards[9].

FOOTNOTES

[1] The ad hoc committee was composed of Warren C. Lovinger, Chairman, President, Central Missouri State College; Nathaniel Evers, University of Denver; Asahel Woodruff, University of Utah; Sister Mary Emil, President, Marygrove College; and Edwin P. Adkins, AACTE staff. The committee submitted its report to the Association in February 1966.

[2] Membership of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee was Edwin P. Adkins, Chairman, Associate Vice-President, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennslyvania; Paul F. Sharp, Vice-Chairman, President, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa; Harry S. Broudy, Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana; Robert N. Bush, Professor of Education, College of Education, Stanford University, California; Sister Mary Emil, Director of Education and Research Center, Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan; Margaret Knispel, Assistant Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Washington, D. C.; Margaret Lindsey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York; Warren C. Lovinger, President, Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg; Robert Mac Vicar, Chancellor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; E. C. Merrill, President, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C.; and Harold Shane, University Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. The late Kimball Wiles, former dean of the College of Education, University of Florida, was also a member of the committee until his untimely death in early 1968. Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary of AACTE, was the staff member.

[3] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education: A Source Book on Selected Issues. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1967.

[4] Major portions of this section were adapted from an article by Karl Massanari published in the Spring 1969 issue of the Journal of Teacher Education, under the title "The AACTE-NCATE Feasibility Project: A Test of Proposed New Accreditation Standards for Teacher Education."

[5] The contract was amended subsequently to extend the termination date to September 30, 1969.

[6] The project staff was composed of the NCATE central staff: Rolf Larson, Director, Andrew J. Holley, and Bernard Rezabek; and two members of the AACTE professional staff: Richard James, associated director of the project, and Karl Massanari, director.

[7] Consultants for the final evaluation session were Norman Burns, Executive Director, Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education; Frank G. Dickey, Executive Director, National Commission on Accrediting; John R. Mayor, Director of Education, American Association for the Advancement of Science; John R. Proffitt, Director, Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff, Bureau of Higher Education, United States Office of Education; and James Steffensen, United States Office of Education.

8 Walter Le Baron, Education Systems Department, System Development Corporation, 5720 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041, was commissioned to prepare an anaylsis of the proposed standards. His report provided valuable input during the final revison phase of the Evaluative Criteria Study.

9 The AACTE has appointed a new Committee on Standards which is charged with the responsibility to review continually the new standards in light of experience in using them, in light of societal changes, and in relation to advances in the state of the art of teacher education; and to recommend revisions in the standards as deemed necessary. The membership of this committee is composed of: Margaret Lindsey, Chairman, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York; Herman Branson, President, Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio; Samuel G. Gates, President, Wisconsin State University, La Crosse, Wisconsin; David Krathwohl, Dean, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York; Harold G. Shane, University Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Sister Mary Fidelma Spiering, Chairman, Department of Education, Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oregon; Merle Wood, Science Teacher, Kern County Union High School District, South High School, 1101 Planz Road, Bakersfield, California; NCATE Liaison Representative - Doran Christensen, Music Teacher, Jefferson High School, 1101 Douglas Street, Alexandria, Minnesota; and Karl Massanari, Associate Director, AACTE,as the staff member.

APPENDIXES

A-1 "Opinionaire: The Standards for Accrediting Teacher Education."

B "Professional Associations and Learned Societies Participating in the AACTE Evaluative Criteria Study."

C Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: A Draft of the Proposed New Standards, with Study Guide.

D " A Summary of Revisions of Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, May 1968."

E "Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, April 1968."

F Evaluative Instrument for the AACTE/NCATE Feasibility Project: Institutional Representatives, January 1969.

G Evaluative Instrument for the AACTE/NCATE Feasibility Project: Visiting Team Members, January 1969.

H Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, March 1970

I "An Analysis of the Differences Between the New Standards for Accrediting Teacher Education and the Former NCATE Standards."

J Financial Report.

A-1

aacte

OPINIONAIRE: THE STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITING TEACHER EDUCATION

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Evaluative Criteria Study Committee
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036

1. Name ______________________________

2. Position (Check one):
   - a. ___ Total-institution administrator
   - b. ___ Liberal arts administrator
   - c. ___ Teacher education administrator
   - d. ___ Other (Please specify):

3. Institution or organization ______________________________

4. Location ______________________________
   (Street) (City) (State)

5. Total enrollment—include full-time plus part-time and undergraduate plus graduate enrollment (If applicable, check one):
   - a. ___ Under 1,000
   - b. ___ 1,001 to 5,000
   - c. ___ 5,001 to 10,000
   - d. ___ 10,001 to 15,000
   - e. ___ 15,001 to 20,000
   - f. ___ Over 20,000

6. Type of institution (If applicable, check one):
   - a. ___ Teacher education college
   - b. ___ Liberal arts college
   - c. ___ Multi-purpose college
   - d. ___ Medium-scope university
   - e. ___ Complex university
   - f. ___ Specialized graduate school

7. Respondent's experience with NCATE accreditation of teacher education:
   - a. As a member of NCATE accrediting teams, committees, etc. (Check one):
     (1) ___ Frequent (2) ___ Occasional (3) ___ None
   - b. As a member of an institution undergoing NCATE accreditation (Check one):
     (1) ___ Study committee (2) ___ Faculty (3) ___ None

8. Indicate how you feel in general about the principle of national accreditation of teacher education (Check one):
   - a. ___ Strongly positive
   - b. ___ Mildly positive
   - c. ___ Neutral
   - d. ___ Mildly negative
   - e. ___ Strongly negative
   - f. ___ No opinion

9. In your opinion, how acceptable are present NCATE accreditation procedures? (Check one):
   - a. ___ Very acceptable
   - b. ___ Acceptable
   - c. ___ Partially acceptable
   - d. ___ Unacceptable
   - e. ___ Very unacceptable
   - f. ___ No opinion

More

Please refer to the enclosed AACTE Evaluative Criteria Reference Paper No. 1 in answering items 10 through 37 below. In these items:

- **understandability implies clearness related to evaluative criteria;**
- **significance implies relevancy to the evaluation of teacher education; and**
- **comprehensiveness implies the inclusion of the essential elements in the evaluative criteria.**

10. Is STANDARD I understandable? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

11. Is STANDARD I significant? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

12. Is STANDARD I appropriately comprehensive? ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

13. If you have other comments about STANDARD I, indicate here:

---

14. Is STANDARD II understandable? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

15. Is STANDARD II significant? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

16. Is STANDARD II appropriately comprehensive? ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

17. If you have other comments about STANDARD II, indicate here:

18. Is STANDARD III understandable? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

19. Is STANDARD III significant? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

20. Is STANDARD III appropriately comprehensive? ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

21. If you have other comments about STANDARD III, indicate here:

22. Is STANDARD IV understandable? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

23. Is STANDARD IV significant? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

24. Is STANDARD IV appropriately comprehensive? ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

25. If you have other comments about STANDARD IV, indicate here:

26. Is STANDARD V understandable? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

27. Is STANDARD V significant? . . . . ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

28. Is STANDARD V appropriately comprehensive? ___Yes ___No (If "no," explain):

29. If you have other comments about STANDARD V, indicate here:

30. Is STANDARD VI understandable? . . . . ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

31. Is STANDARD VI significant? . . . . ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

32. Is STANDARD VI appropriately comprehensive? ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

33. If you have other comments about STANDARD VI, indicate here:

34. Is STANDARD VII understandable? . . . . ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

35. Is STANDARD VII significant? . . . . ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

36. Is STANDARD VII appropriately comprehensive? ____ Yes ____ No (If "no," explain):

37. If you have other comments about STANDARD VII, indicate here:

More

38. Indicate here better alternatives for the evaluation of teacher education programs which you have to suggest:

39. Indicate ways in which you would be willing to participate further in the study, if asked to do so (Check all which apply):

- **a. ____ Participate in regional conferences.**
- **b. ____ Serve as discussion leader for conference discussion group.**
- **c. ____ Serve as recorder for conference discussion group.**
- **d. ____ Attend the open meeting of the Evaluative Criteria Committee at the AACTE Annual Meeting in Chicago, February 15-17, 1967.**
- **e. ____ Other (Tell what):**

B

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEARNED SOCIETIES PARTICIPATING IN THE AACTE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA STUDY

January 1969

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. - Washington, D. C. 20036

American Association for the Advancement of Science	Dael Wolfe, Executive Officer, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005 387-7171
American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation	Carl Troester, Jr. Executive Secretary NEA - Room 627 Ext. 400
American Association of Physics Teachers	Mark W. Zemansky, Executive Secretary 335 East 45th Street New York, New York 10017 212-685-1940
American Association of School Administrators	Forrest E. Conner, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 221 Ext. 621
American Association of School Librarians	La Quida Vinson, Executive Secretary 50 East Huron Street Chicago, Illinois 60611
American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture	Earl H. Knebal Department of Agricultural Education Texas A & M College Station, Texas 77843
American Association of University Professors	Bertram H. Davis, Deputy General Secretary 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 462-4332
American Association of University Women	Pauline Tompkins, General Director 2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20037 338-4300
American Chemical Society	Bradford R. Stanerson, Executive Secretary 1115 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 737-3337
American Council on Education	Edward J. Shoben, Jr., Director Commission on Academic Affairs 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 483-6620
American Council of Learned Societies	Frederick Burkhardt, President 345 East 46th Street New York, New York 10017 212-986-7393

American Education Research Association	Richard A. Dershimer, Executive Officer NEA - Room 203 Ext. 339
American Federation of Teachers	Charles Cogen, President 716 North Rush Street Chicago, Illinois 60611
American Historical Association	Paul L. Ward, Executive Secretary 400 "A" Street, S. E. Washington, D. C. 20003 544-2422
American Home Economics Association	Doris E. Hanson, Executive Director 1600 Twentieth Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20009 387-0158
American Industrial Arts Association	Howard S. Decker, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 722 Ext. 440
American Institute of Biological Science	R. Krauss University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742
American Institute of Physics	Arnold A. Strassenburg, Director Education and Manpower Division 335 East 45th Street New York, New York 10017 212-685-1940
American Library Association	David H. Clift, Executive Director 50 East Huron Street Chicago, Illinois 60611 312-944-6780
American Mathematical Society	J. W. Green University of California Los Angeles, California 90024
American Personnel and Guidance Association	Willis E. Dugan, Executive Director 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20009 483-4633
American Psychological Association	Sherman Ross, Executive Secretary 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 296-7310

American Speech and Hearing Association	Kenneth O. Johnson, Executive Secretary 9030 Old Georgetown Road Washington, D. C. 20014 530-3400
American Vocational Association	Lowell A. Burkett, Executive Director 1025 Fifteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005 737-6206
Association for American Colleges	Richard H. Sullivan, President 1818 "R" Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005 265-3137
Association of American Geographers	Dr. Warren Nystrom, Executive Secretary 1146 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 296-6345
Association for Childhood Education International	Alberta L. Meyer, Executive Director 3615 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20016 363-6963
Association of Classroom Teachers	Margaret Stevenson, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 305 Ext. 361
Association for the Education of Teachers in Science	Frank X. Sutman Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122 215-787-8005
Association for Field Service in Teacher Education	Harold Young, President Central Missouri State College Warrensburg, Missouri 64093 816-747-6539
Association of General and Liberal Studies	Douglas Dunham, Secretary Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48823 517-355-9733
Association of School, College and University Staffing	Evart W. Ardis, President 3200 Student Administration Building University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104 313-764-7457
Association of State Colleges and Universities	Allen W. Ostar, Executive Director 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 462-6770

Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges	R. I. Thackrey, Executive Director 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 265-4919
Association for Student Teaching	Richard Collier, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 426 Ext. 638
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development	Fred T. Wilhelms, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 428 Ext. 200
Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf	Edward W. Tillinghast, President School for the Deaf and Blind P.O. Box 5545 Tuscon, Arizona 85703 602-622-3504
Council for Basic Education	Mortimer Smith, Executive Secretary 725 Fifteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 347-4171
Council for Chief State School Officers	Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 802 Ext. 349 (Dr. Don Dafoe in April, 1969
Council for Exceptional Children	William C. Geer, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 411 Ext. 455
Department of Audiovisual Instruction	Anna L. Hyer, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 712 Ext. 325
Department of Elementary School Principals	Robert W. Eaves, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 301 Ext. 472
Mathematical Association of American	Harry M. Gehman, Executive Director University of Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214 716-831-3404
Modern Language Association of America	John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary 62 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10011 212-691-3200

Music Educators National Conference	Charles Gary, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 401 Ext. 441
National Art Education Association	Charles M. Dorn, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 701E Ext. 491
National Association of Independent Schools	Carry Potter, President #4 Liberty Square Boston, Massachusetts 02109 617-542-1988
National Association of Schools of Art	Robert L. Bertoli Massachusetts College of Art 364 Brookline Avanue Boston, Massachusetts 02215 617-731-2341
National Association of Schools of Music	David A. Ledet, Executive Secretary 1501 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 232-2885
National Association of Secondary School Principals	Ellsworth Tompkins, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 401 Ext. 423
National Catholic Educational Association	Rev. C. W. Friedman 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036 234-7800
National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards	Roy Edelfelt, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 423 Ext. 611
National Council for the Social Studies	Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 208 Ext. 376
National Council of State Education Association	Elmer S. Crowley, Administrative Director NEA - Room 614 Ext. 591
National Council of Teachers of English	Robert F. Hogan, Executive Secretary 508 South Sixth Street Champaign, Illinois 61820 217-352-0523

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics	James D. Gates, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 701 Ext. 432
National School Boards Association, Inc.	H. W. Webb, Executive Director 1233 Central Street Evanston, Illinois 60201 312-869-7730
National Science Teachers Association	Robert H. Carleton, Executive Secretary NEA - Room 809 Ext. 521
National Society of College Teachers of Education	E. H. Goldenstein University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Philosophy of Education Society	Mattin Levit, President School of Education University of Missouri Kansas City, Missouri 64110 816-276-2247
Speech Association of America	William Work, Executive Secretary Statler Hilton Hotel New York, New York 10001 212-736-6625
Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education	W. P. Ewens, President Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma
University Council for Education	Jack Culbertson, Executive Director 29 West Woodruff Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43210 614-293-2564

c

Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

A Draft of the Proposed New Standards, with Study Guide

December 1967

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

The printing and distribution of this preliminary draft to selected representatives of teacher preparing institutions and professional organizations is made possible by a grant from the Esso Education Foundation, 49 West 49 Street, New York, N. Y. The Association acknowledges with gratitude this contribution and the previous contributions of the Esso Education Foundation to the Evaluative Criteria Study.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Second printing, March 1968
Third printing, November 1968

[redacted]

Dr. Edward C. Pomeroy, *Executive Secretary*

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 • (202) 483-6650

December 20, 1967

To Colleagues in Education:

This is the first published draft of the Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is proud of the forward step in accrediting college and university teacher education programs which is represented by this volume.

This draft is but one step along the way toward the development and acceptance of standards and evaluative criteria which will more adequately meet the needs of the changing and developing field of teacher education and of our society. Your further helpful participation is invited in the substantial effort currently under way to involve the best thought available regarding teacher education and its evaluation. This particular publication is organized to assist you in studying the results to date and to encourage your comments and constructive criticism. The Association will analyze reactions carefully, revise and test these proposed standards, and recommend a final set of standards to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Sincerely yours,

Edward C. Pomeroy

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Secretary

ECP:rf

Contents

Page
Letter of Transmittal.......... 1
Foreword 5
Study Guide 7
Introductory Statement 10

The Standards and Evaluative Criteria:

PART I: *Basic Programs*—Programs for the Preparation of Teachers Through the Baccalaureate, Fifth-Year, and Master's Degree Levels.

1. *The Program of Instruction for Teacher Education*

1.1 The General Studies Component.......... 12
1.2 The Professional Studies Component.......... 12
1.3 The Professional Studies Component: Content for the Field of Specialization.......... 13
(Content to be taught to pupils)
(Supplementary knowledge from the subject matter field(s) to be taught and from allied fields)
(Theory and Practice)
1.4 The Professional Studies Component: Humanistic and Behavioral Studies.......... 14
1.5 and 1.6 The Professional Studies Component: Educational Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience 14
1.7 The Professional Studies Component: Practice 15
1.8 Role of Research in the Program.......... 16
1.9 Control of the Program.......... 16

2. *Faculty for Teacher Education*

2.1 Size and Quality of Faculty.......... 16
2.2 Preparation of Faculty.......... 17
2.3 Faculty Load 17
2.4 Part-Time Faculty 18
2.5 Faculty Involvement with Schools.......... 18

3. *Students in Teacher Education*

3.1 Admission to Teacher Education Programs.......... 18
3.2 Use of National Norms.......... 19
3.3 Screening on the Basis of Academic Achievement.......... 19
3.4 Screening on the Basis of Personality Characteristics.......... 19
3.5 Student Personnel Services.......... 19
3.6 Student Involvement in the Teacher Education Program 20

4. *Resources and Facilities for Teacher Education*

4.1 The Library 20
4.2 The Materials and Instructional Media Center.......... 21
4.3 Physical Facilities 21
4.4 Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources.......... 21
4.5 Clerical and Supporting Services.......... 22

5. *Evaluation* Page

5.1 Evaluation of Graduates.......... 22
5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Programs.......... 22
5.3 Long-Range Planning.......... 23

Part II: *Advanced Programs*—Programs Beyond the Master's Level for the Advanced Preparation of Teachers and Programs Beyond the Baccalaureate Level for the Preparation of Specialized School Personnel.

G-1. *Instructional Program*

G-1.1 Purpose of Advanced Programs.......... 24
G-1.2 Content of Advanced Programs.......... 24
G-1.3 Direct and/or Simulated Experiences.......... 25
G-1.4 Role of Research.......... 25
G-1.5 Individualization of Programs of Study.......... 25
G-1.6 Quality of Graduate Study: Graduate Credit.......... 26
G-1.7 Quality of Graduate Study: Enrollment in Courses.......... 26
G-1.8 Quality of Graduate Study: Residence Requirement.......... 26
G-1.9 Control of the Program.......... 26

G-2. *Faculty for Advanced Programs in Education*

G-2.1 Qualifications of Faculty: Experience and Scholarly Competence.......... 27
G-2.2 Qualifications of Faculty: Academic Preparation.......... 27
G-2.3 Quality and Size of Faculty in Education.......... 27
G-2.4 Part-Time Faculty.......... 28
G-2.5 Faculty Load.......... 28
G-2.6 Faculty Involvement in Research.......... 28

G-3. *Students in Advanced Programs in Education*

G-3.1 Admission to Advanced Programs in Education.......... 29
G-3.2 Screening of Students.......... 29
G-3.3 Supervision of Students' Programs of Study in Education.......... 30
G-3.4 Quality of Student Body.......... 30

G-4. *Resources and Physical Facilities for Advanced Programs in Education*

G-4.1 The Library.......... 30
G-4.2 Physical Facilities.......... 31
G-4.3 Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources.......... 31
G-4.4 Clerical and Other Supporting Services.......... 31
G-4.5 Allocation of Funds for Research.......... 32

G-5. *Evaluation*

G-5.1 Evaluation of Graduates.......... 32
G-5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Programs.......... 32
G-5.3 Long-Range Planning.......... 33
Appendix—Present NCATE Standards.......... 34

Foreword

This preliminary draft of new standards and evaluative criteria for accrediting teacher education is the result of the first phase of the Evaluative Criteria Study—a three-year project sponsored by The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The wide distribution of the preliminary draft is in keeping with the Association's belief that many responsible people must be involved in the process of developing new accrediting standards for teacher education.

The responsibility for carrying on a systematic program of evaluation of standards and development of new and revised standards is allocated to AACTE in the Constitution of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).[1] To carry out this responsibility, AACTE in 1966 established the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee and employed a full-time associate secretary to work with the Committee. A three-fold task was assigned to this Committee: (a) to recommend appropriate changes in the present accrediting standards, (b) to identify problem areas needing research, and (c) to propose a plan for the continuous reappraisal of the revised standards.

The first year (1966-67) of the Evaluative Criteria Study[2] was designed to inform people about the accreditation of teacher education, stimulate discussion on the basic issues involved in revising accreditation standards, "feel the pulse" of responsible educators regarding these issues, and collect ideas for revising the present standards. An Opinionaire was constructed to sample the attitudes of educators about the present NCATE standards and to gather new ideas which might be incorporated in the revised standards. Opinionaires were mailed to 3,200 persons representing the colleges and universities engaged in preparing teachers, professional associations and learned societies, state departments of education, and the teaching profession. The Committee studied and analyzed the 1,538 responses received from the respondents.

Resource materials were prepared to present information about the current accrediting standards and to stimulate discussion on revising them. Materials prepared for the first year of the Study included an information bulletin; AACTE Evaluative Criteria Reference Papers No. 1, 2, and 3; and *Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education—A Source Book on Selected Issues.*[3]

Five regional conferences (San Francisco, Denver, Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.) were held from March through May 1967 involving 863 participants. Representatives from colleges and universities, specialized interest groups, state departments of education, and the profession were invited to participate in the conferences. Of the 863 participants, 647 represented institutions preparing teachers, 133 represented professional associations and learned societies, and 83 were from the public schools. Participants discussed issues and formulated proposals for the revision of the present accrediting standards.

The comments, suggestions, and criticisms of Study participants which were gathered during the first year were summarized and analyzed by the Committee. The findings guided the Committee in its deliberations as it reached agreement on the basic issues and as it formulated the preliminary draft of the revised standards.

A study guide is included as part of this document to assist readers in focusing their attention on some of the more important features of the proposed standards. The present NCATE accreditation standards also are included in this document (Appendix) as a reference for readers who wish to compare the proposed new standards with the current ones.

Recipients of this preliminary draft are invited to submit their reactions to the proposed standards on the enclosed response card and by letter. Reactions should be submitted before March 1, 1968, to:

KARL MASSANARI, *Associate Secretary*
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

The Committee will make appropriate revisions of the proposed standards following an analysis of the reactions received. The revised standards and evaluative criteria then will be tried out experimentally in six to eight pilot institutions. The trial run will be an AACTE-NCATE cooperative project.

The Committee anticipates making its recommendations for revised accrediting standards to the AACTE Executive Committee sometime in late 1969. Upon approval by the Executive Committee the recommendations will then be transmitted to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education for final action and implementation.

---

[1] See Article VII, Sections B and C, 1965 NCATE Constitution. NCATE is approved by the National Commission on Accrediting as the official national accrediting agency for teacher education. Communications to the accrediting agency should be addressed to Rolf W. Larson, Director, NCATE, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

[2] A progress report on the first year of the Evaluative Criteria Study was published in the September 1967 issue of the *AACTE Bulletin.*

[3] Copies of this publication are available at $2.50 each. Order from Dr. Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Secretary, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Members of AACTE's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee are:

Chairman—**Edwin P. Adkins**, Director, Office of Research & Program Development
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vice-Chairman—**Paul F. Sharp**, President
Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

Harry S. Broudy, Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of Illinois
(On leave at the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California)

Robert N. Bush, Professor of Education, College of Education
Stanford University, Stanford, California

Mrs. Margaret Knispel, Head, Department of English, Beaverton High School, Beaverton, Oregon
(On leave at the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D. C.)

Warren C. Lovinger, President
Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri

Robert MacVicar, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

Sister Mary Emil, President
Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan

E. C. Merrill, Dean, College of Education
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee

Kimball Wiles, Dean, College of Education
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Secretary

December 1967

Study Guide

For the Proposed Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

As noted in the Foreword, this study guide is included to assist readers in focusing their attention on some of the more important features of the proposed new standards for the accreditation of teacher education. The chief differences between the proposed standards and those currently being used by NCATE are noted below. The present standards also are included in this document (Appendix) to assist readers in making comparisons.

Readers are encouraged to study the proposed accrediting standards, register their opinions on the enclosed response card, and return the card by mail before March 1, 1968. Readers are invited to submit additional comments about the proposed standards by letter addressed to:

KARL MASSANARI, *Associate Secretary*
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Comments

1. *The organization of the proposed standards is different from that of the present standards.*
   a. Two categories of standards are proposed: one for *basic* programs and the other for *advanced* programs. The standards in the first category (Part I) are applicable to all programs for the preparation of teachers through the baccalaureate, fifth-year, and master's degree levels; those in the second category (Part II) are applicable to all programs beyond the master's level for the advanced preparation of teachers, and to all programs beyond the baccalaureate degree for the preparation of specialized school personnel. Formal accreditation will be extended for each category as a whole, i.e., for *all* or *none* of the programs in the category being offered by the institution.
   b. The standards in both Part I and Part II are grouped under five broad headings: program of instruction, faculty, students, resources, and evaluation.
   c. Each *standard* is preceded by a *preamble* which gives its rationale, states the underlying assumptions, interprets its meaning, and defines unfamiliar terms. The evaluative *criteria* which follow each standard are designed to elicit the kinds of evidence that will show the extent to which each standard is met.

2. *The proposed standards include more specificity than do the present standards.*
   a. More specificity is introduced as a result of increasing the number of standards: 28 standards are proposed for basic programs, 27 for advanced programs.
   b. Further specificity is introduced through the inclusion of evaluative criteria for each standard. There are 120 evaluative criteria for the 28 standards in Part I; 99 for the 27 standards in Part II.
   c. It is assumed that the proposed standards and evaluative criteria are specific enough to be used by institutions and NCATE evaluators without a supplementary guide.

3. *The proposed standards reflect a change in the significance of various aspects of a teacher education program for evaluation purposes—by giving greater or less consideration to certain elements included in the present NCATE standards.*

Comments

a. There is less emphasis in the proposed standards on objectives, per se. It is believed that institutional objectives for teacher education will be reflected in the rationale and content of the various programs offered, in the policies which are implemented, and in the allocation of personnel and physical resources to support the program.

b. Less attention in the proposed standards is given to patterns of organization and administration. It is believed that the proposed standards give a more appropriate perspective to the importance of organization and administration in evaluating teacher education programs. (See 1.9 and G-1.9)

c. There is more emphasis in the proposed standards on the quality of the faculty for teacher education. Note especially the consideration given to preparation of faculty, faculty load, part-time faculty, and faculty involvement with schools. (See 2.1 to 2.5, and G-2.1 to G-2.6)

d. The proposed standards place greater emphasis on the importance of the quality of students admitted to teacher education programs. Note especially the attention given to admission to teacher education programs, use of national norms, and screening on the basis of academic achievement and personality characteristics. (See 3.1 to 3.5, and G-3.1 to G-3.4)

e. More consideration in the proposed standards is given to the importance of evaluating the academic achievement and classroom performance of students in teacher education programs. (See 1.16, 1.72, 1.82, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.1, G-3.13, G-3.21, and G-5:1)

f. It is believed that the proposed standards permit a considerable amount of latitude in designing and conducting preparation programs for teachers and other school service personnel. It is intended that they will encourage responsible innovation and experimentation.

g. The proposed standards give more attention to the areas of study which should be included in the general education component for basic programs of teacher education. Note that the standard (1.1) specifies a minimum amount of time which should be devoted to studies in general education, and that particular areas of study are specified.

h. Considerable attention in the proposed standards is given to the elements which should be included in the professional studies component in basic teacher education programs. Note especially that the component includes the content for the field of specialization, humanistic and behavioral studies, educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and internship. (See 1.2 to 1.7)

i. The proposed standards call attention to the quality of the relationship between the teacher preparing institution and the cooperating schools, and to the importance of faculty involvement with elementary and secondary schools. (See 1.73, 1.75, 2.5, 5.1, G-2.1, and G-5.1)

j. The importance of the joint participation of the academic staff and the teacher education faculty in making certain decisions about the teacher education program is stressed. (See 1.17, 1.32, and 1.33)

k. The importance of educational technology and instructional media is stressed in the proposed standards. (See 4.2 and G-4.2)

l. The unique character of graduate study in teacher education is emphasized in a number of ways in the proposed standards. Part II is devoted entirely to advanced programs at the graduate level. Note especially the standards dealing with the purpose of advanced programs (G-1.1), their content (G-1.2 and G-1.3), the role of research (G-1.4), individualization of programs of study (G-1.5), quality of graduate study (G-1.6, G-1.7, and G-1.8), qualifications and size of faculty (G-2.1, G-2.2, and G-2.3), faculty load (G-2.5), faculty involvement in research (G-2.6), quality of student body (G-3.1, G-3.2, and G-3.4), and allocation of resources (G-4.1 to G-4.5).

4. ***The proposed standards reflect a change in the significance of various aspects of a teacher education program for evaluation purposes—through the addition of certain new elements not included in the present NCATE standards.***
   a. There are standards dealing with the evaluation of the graduates and the use of the results from such evaluations. (See 5.1, 5.2, G-5.1, and G-5.2)
   b. The importance of the quality of instruction is stressed in the proposed standards. (See 1.18, 1.37, 1.45, 1.55, 1.64, G-1.25, and G-1.34)
   c. Attention is given to the role of research in both basic and advanced programs. (See 1.8, G-1.4, G-2.6, and G-4.5)
   d. Emphasis is given to the importance of long-range planning for teacher education programs. (See 5.3 and G-5.3)
   e. There is a standard dealing with student involvement in teacher education programs. (See 3.6)
   f. Direct and/or simulated experiences are included as one of the required elements for advanced programs. (See G-1.3)

5. ***The proposed standards make reference to the guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel which have been developed by professional associations and learned societies.***

   It is believed that a number of professional associations and learned societies, because of a special interest in the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel, potentially have a significant contribution to make to the improvement of teacher education programs. Some of these organizations already have prepared guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel; others are in the process of doing so. It is assumed in the standards that each institution will work out the rationale for its various teacher education programs—basic and advanced—with due consideration for the recommendations in such guidelines. (See 1.35, 1.43, 1.53, 1.63, 1.78, 4.14, G-1.24, G-1.35, G-4.12, and G-4.25)

Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

Introductory Statement

National accreditation of institutional programs for preparing teachers for all grades and subjects and school service personnel at the elementary and secondary school levels is the exclusive responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE has been authorized by the National Commission on Accrediting to adopt standards and to continue the development of policies and procedures for accreditation. The NCATE is also responsible for implementing accreditation procedures and determining the accreditation status of teacher education programs.

The standards and evaluative criteria presented herein state conditions of acceptability for accreditation. They are the means through which the purposes of national accreditation can be achieved.

Purposes of National Accreditation of Teacher Education

National accreditation of teacher education serves three major purposes:

1. It helps to protect children and youth from ill-prepared school personnel.
2. It assures the public that particular institutions—those named in the *Annual List*—offer programs of teacher education which meet national standards.
3. It provides a practical basis for reciprocity among the states in certifying professional personnel.

While these are the main purposes for the accreditation of teacher education, it is assumed that an indirect outcome of the accreditation process will be the improvement of the teaching profession through the improvement of preparation programs.

Institutional Self-Governance and National Accreditation

Both public and private institutions of higher learning in the United States have a long heritage of self-governance. The right of colleges and universities to set their own goals and to shape their own destinies has accounted for a large measure of the excellence—and perhaps inadequacy as well—which is found among institutions of higher learning today. The freedom of institutions to move toward higher levels of excellence should be encouraged and supported by national accreditation. When accreditation distracts an institution from this mission or encroaches upon its freedom to accomplish it, the accreditation process has become inconsistent with its own purposes.

It is equally true, however, that national accreditation can exert a countervailing force when institutions aspire to expand programs beyond the capacity of available resources, and when they offer marginal or poor programs. National accreditation represents a common floor of acceptability. However, each institution of higher learning is free to seek or not seek national accreditation.

Institutional Experimentation and Innovation

The NCATE encourages responsible experimentation and innovation as a rational and systematic basis for long-range improvement of teacher education. If the autonomy of institutions of higher education in the United States is to be real, each college and university should have freedom to engage in experimentation and innovation. National accreditation should neither encroach upon an institution's self-governance nor encroach upon the institution's right to be inventive. In order to encourage experimentation and innovation, the standards and evaluative criteria permit a great deal of latitude in designing and conducting preparation programs. However, the institution must assume full responsibility for the quality of experimental programs.

National Standards and Evaluative Criteria

Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education certifies that the institution's programs for preparing teachers and other professional school personnel meet its standards. This certification validates the quality of an instructional program, and signifies that persons recommended by the institution can be expected to perform satisfactorily in typical teaching and service positions throughout the United States. The standards and evaluative criteria which are applied to programs are "minimum standards" for acceptability. They are designed as guides for estimating the adequacy of institutional programs. Any type of regionally accredited institution can fulfill the standards if the institution has a clear understanding of the teaching function and a serious commitment to teacher education, and if it allocates its resources appropriately.

The standards set forth in this document are "minimum standards," and therefore the NCATE urges institutions to set higher standards for themselves, and through experimentation and research, to strive for better ways to prepare teachers and school service personnel.

Each *standard* is preceded by a *preamble* which gives its rationale, states the underlying assumptions, interprets its meaning, and defines unfamiliar terms. The evaluative *criteria* which follow each standard are designed to elicit the kinds of evidence that will show the extent to which the standard is met. It is not assumed that the evaluative criteria included for each standard are exhaustive; an institution may suggest other criteria to show how it is meeting a standard.

The Continuous Review of Standards and Evaluative Criteria

The revised (1965) Constitution of the NCATE (Article VII, Section B) states:

> Responsibility for carrying on a systematic program of evaluation of standards and development of new and revised standards shall be allocated to the AACTE. The AACTE shall insure the participation of representatives of institutions, organizations and fields of study concerned with teacher education, and the Council. The AACTE shall receive and consider recommendations about existing or revised standards from institutions which prepare teachers and from individuals and organizations concerned with teacher education.

This provision explicitly calls for the continuous review and development of standards. It also calls for the systematic involvement of professional groups, learned societies, individuals, institutional representatives, and members of the Council in this process. Thus, the revised constitution provides for continuous review, development, and testing of standards with maximum involvement of those persons and organizations most directly concerned with their application and impact.

If accreditation standards are to reflect changing conditions in higher education generally and in teacher education particularly, they will not remain static or be pegged to any level of excellence. It is expected that from time to time the floor of acceptability will be raised. This means that as standards evolve and are improved, institutions can expect to meet new and different standards on reaccreditation. If subsequent to their reaccreditation they choose to expand or to establish new programs of specialized study, the adequacy of these changes must be examined. The reaccreditation of institutional programs therefore can be as challenging as initial accreditation.

Applicability of the Standards and Evaluative Criteria

Separate sets of standards and evaluative criteria are to be applied to *basic* and to *advanced* programs of teacher education. *Basic* refers to all programs for the preparation of teachers whether they are four-year, five-year, or master's level programs. *Advanced* refers to all programs beyond the master's level for the advanced (in addition to the basic) preparation of teachers, and to all programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the preparation of specialized school personnel.

The standards in Part I are to be applied to all *basic* programs: programs for the preparation of teachers (kindergarten through the twelfth grade) through the baccalaureate, fifth-year, and master's degree levels. They are not to be applied to programs for the preparation of teacher aides or other paraprofessionals.

The standards in Part II are to be applied to all *advanced* programs: programs beyond the master's level for the advanced preparation of teachers, and programs beyond the baccalaureate level for specialized school personnel. They are not to be applied to programs for the preparation of college teachers or non-school personnel.

Eligibility for National Accreditation

Institutions which meet the following two conditions qualify for evaluation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education:

1. Institutions offering basic degree programs for preparing teachers and/or school service personnel.
2. Institutions accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association and state departments of education at the levels and in the categories for which NCATE accreditation is sought.

The Council regards accreditation by a regional accrediting association as reasonable assurance as to the overall quality of an institution, including its general financial stability, the effectiveness of its administration, the adequacy of its general facilities, the quality of its student personnel program, the appropriateness of its overall program of study, the strength of its faculty, the adequacy of its faculty personnel policies, and the quality of instruction.

An institution accepted for evaluation shall present for review:

1. *All basic programs:* programs offered for the preparation of elementary, secondary, and kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers (programs resulting in the recommendation for professional certification) whether they are four-year, five-year, or master's programs; and/or
2. *All advanced programs:* programs beyond the master's level for the advanced preparation of teachers, and programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the preparation of specialized school personnel.

Part I of the standards is to be applied to all programs in the first category, and Part II to those in the second category. Formal accreditation will be extended for each category as a whole, i.e., for *all* or *none* of the programs in the category being offered by the institution.

PART I: BASIC PROGRAMS

Programs for the Preparation of Teachers Through the Baccalaureate, Fifth-Year, and Master's Degree Levels.

1. The Program of Instruction for Teacher Education

1.1 The General Studies Component

Teachers ought to have as much general education as it is possible for them to have—not only because they require it as cultivated human beings, but also because subjects studied in general education may support their teaching field. Moreover, only a well-informed, cultivated person presents an adequate model for children and youth in the school environment.

Institutional programs of general or liberal education vary widely, although certain elements are usually to be found in all of them. This precludes prescribing general education in terms of subjects and credit hours. The view reflected in the standard is that general education should include the studies most widely generalizable to life and further learning. The *areas* of studies designated below satisfy this requirement and encompass the contents of most of the standard patterns of general education. Far more important than the specific content of general education is that it be taught with generalizability rather than with academic specialization as a primary objective.

It should be noted that no optimum amount of time for general education has been designated. The figures suggested in the standard refer to four- and five-year programs. In addition, the general education requirement is not regarded as necessarily meeting, in full, the prospective teacher's need for the study of academic subject matter (see standard 1.2).

As used in the standard, "symbolics of information" is that part of general education which deals with communication through symbols, including studies in such areas as linguistics, languages, communication skills, mathematics, logic, and information theory.

THE STANDARD

1.1 *The general studies component of the program for prospective teachers requires that from one-third to one-half time be devoted to studies in the symbolics of information, basic physical and behavioral sciences, and humanities.*

1.11 Are courses, seminars, and readings offered in each area of general studies identified in the standard?

1.12 What are the arrangements for insuring that a distribution, or series, of courses, seminars, and readings are taken in each area of general studies?

1.13 What measures are taken to make sure that the programs of all prospective teachers meet the institution's standard requirements in general studies?

1.14 What evidence (such as state and regional accreditation reports, student achievement data, and/or scholarship awards) is available to estimate the quality of the general studies component of the teacher education program?

1.15 What ratio between the general studies component and the professional studies component (including academic specialization) is the institution seeking to maintain?

1.16 What evidence is there that some assessment is made at the beginning of the program of the level and quality of each student's general education background and that appropriate individualization of his program is made?

1.17 What evidence is available to show that the selection of content for the general studies component of the teacher education program embodies the judgment of both the academic staff and the teacher education faculty?

1.18 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in the general studies component of the teacher education program?

1.2 The Professional Studies Component

The professional part of the curriculum designed to prepare teachers is to be distinguished from the general studies component: the latter includes whatever instruction is deemed desirable for all educated human beings, regardless of their prospective vocation; the former—professional component—covers all requirements that are justified by the work of the specific vocation of teaching. In the standards that follow (1.2 to 1.7) it is assumed, therefore, that whether a study is to be called general education or professional education does not depend on the name of the study or the department in which the instruction is offered; it depends rather on the function the study is to perform, *viz.*, whether it is to be part of general education or of specialized vocational preparation.

The ingredients (not courses necessarily) of the professional studies component may be classified as follows:

The professional studies component .... Standard 1.2
  Content for the field of specialization .... Standard 1.3
    Content to be taught to pupils
    Supplementary knowledge from the subject matter field(s) to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching
  Theoretical-practice component
    Humanistic and behavioral studies .... Standard 1.4
    Educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience .... Standards 1.5 and 1.6
    Practice .... Standard 1.7

The nature and function of these ingredients will be specified in separate sections.

THE STANDARD

1.2 *The professional studies component of the curriculum includes the following ingredients combined in a rationally designed pattern of instruction: (a) content for the field of specialization—content to be taught to pupils, and supplementary knowledge from the subject matter field(s) to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching; and (b) theoretical-practice component—humanistic and behavioral studies, educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and practice.*

1.21 In the curriculum and in the teaching-learning experiences afforded the student—can the different elements in the professional studies component be clearly identified? How are they specified?

1.22 What evidence indicates that the professional studies component has been systematically constructed? Is the organizing principle of the design specified?

1.23 On what principle is the ratio among different elements in the professional studies component determined?

1.3 The Professional Studies Component: Content for the Field of Specialization

The following standard draws attention to the fact that teaching requires two types of knowledge over and beyond that which is acquired in general education. One is the knowledge that is to be taught to the pupil, e.g., the mathematics one plans to teach, the art one is expected to teach, the literature for children one plans to teach, or the science that one is to teach in the science class. The other type of knowledge will not be taught directly to the pupil, but may be needed by the teacher as a background for the teaching of a particular subject, e.g., Anglo-Saxon for the English teacher, American history for the teacher of American literature, political science for the history teacher, mathematical logic for the teacher of mathematics, or abnormal psychology for the teacher of sex education. It is assumed in this standard that both kinds of knowledge are a required part of the candidate's professional training, although judgments regarding these requirements will be based on collaboration between appropriate members of the staff in the field concerned and the appropriate members of the faculty of education. Nothing in the standard should be construed as implying that instruction in this component for the preparation of teachers must be carried on in any specific school or department or in any specific format, such as "courses."

THE STANDARD

1.3 *The professional studies component of the curriculum includes the specialized study of (a) the content to be taught to pupils, and (b) the supplementary knowledge in the subject matter of the teaching field(s) and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching.*

1.31 What evidence is there that the requirements for special academic studies have been developed specifically to meet the need for:
  a. content to be taught to pupils?
  b. supplementary knowledge from the subject matter of the teaching field(s) to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching?

1.32 What cooperative arrangements exist, and to what degree has cooperation among the total staff occurred in the identification and selection of the special academic studies for the respective teaching fields?

1.33 What evidence indicates that the requirements for special academic studies embody the judgment of both the subject specialization and the educational staff?

1.34 What information indicates that a systematic effort is being made to keep the content of the respective teaching fields current with developments in the appropriate disciplines?

1.35 What evidence confirms that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations for the preparation of teachers made by national professional organizations?[1]

1.36 What evidence is available to show that the programs of all prospective teachers include the appropriate content for their respective specialization fields?

1.37 What procedures are used to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in this part of the professional studies component?

1.4 The Professional Studies Component: Humanistic and Behavioral Studies

Many intellectual disciplines have bearings on the study of education. However, not all disciplines are equally relevant, and their relevance is not always obvious. In the following standard it is assumed that problems concerning nature and aims of education, the curriculum, organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching-learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the philosophical issues to which they are related. These studies are referred to hereafter as the *humanistic studies.* The problems of education can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, and psychology. Such studies will be referred to as *behavioral studies.* These behavioral and humanistic studies differ from the usual study of sociology, economics, philosophy, and history in that they take their departure from problems in education rather than from the problems of the discipline. Some of the behavioral studies may provide empirical generalizations that can be applied to educational practice; when they do, they become part of the educational theory and its applications that one studies in relation to one's field of specialization. However, humanistic and behavioral studies have as their primary purpose to provide the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood or interpreted. Therefore, they constitute a part of all professional curriculums in education.

The humanistic and behavioral studies in the professional component of the curriculum require as a prerequisite a familiarity with the parent disciplines on which they are based. The stating of the desirability of these prerequisites does not presuppose or prescribe any specific set or sequence of courses for meeting them.

THE STANDARD

1.4 *The professional studies component includes instruction in the humanistic studies, e.g., the history and philosophy of education; and the behavioral studies, e.g., sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, and psychology of education.*

1.41 Can the humanistic and behavioral studies be identified in the professional component of the program?

1.42 What evidence exists that the humanistic and behavioral studies identified in 1.41 are oriented toward the problems of educational policy and aims, curriculum, organization and administration, teaching and learning?

1.43 What evidence is there that the recommendations of professional organizations and learned societies for the preparation of teachers have been considered in establishing the requirements for the humanistic and behavioral studies?[2]

1.44 What data show that the programs of all prospective teachers include the humanistic and behavioral studies prescribed by the institution?

1.45 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in this part of the professional studies component?

1.5 & 1.6 The Professional Studies Component: Educational Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience

As distinguished from the humanistic and behavioral studies and content for the field of specialization there is a body of knowledge about teaching and learning that can be the basis for rules of practice. If teaching is to be more than a craft, teachers need to understand the theoretical principles which justify the rules they follow. To this end, the study of teaching-learning theory is included as part of the professional studies component in the preparation of teachers. However, like the study of other empirical theory, the study of the theories of teaching-learning requires laboratory exercises to make abstract principles (and the rules of practice derived from them) more concrete and more intelligible. Much of what has been called both "general" and "special methods" can therefore be taught as the application of educational theory.

---

[1] A number of professional associations and learned societies have as one of their major interests the improvement of teacher education. Some of these organizations have developed guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel in their respective specialization fields. It is assumed that each institution will develop the rationale for its various programs in teacher education with due consideration for the recommendations in these guidelines.

During 1968-69 a number of pilot institutions will be engaged in testing the proposed standards. AACTE will provide a list of the most useful guidelines for these institutions as they study their programs in preparation for an NCATE evaluation.

Eventually, AACTE may assume the responsibility of publishing such a list annually for wider distribution.

[2] See footnote above.

Whereas the study of teaching-learning theory provides the prospective teacher with principles of practice, and the laboratory exercises illuminate and demonstrate these principles, clinical experience in education confronts the student with individual cases or problems—the diagnosis and solution of which involve principles and theory—but also familiarizes him with the *class* of cases to which they belong. Certain kinds of problems in discipline, motivation, testing, lesson planning, and presentation represent recurring types of classroom situations. Clinical teaching involves the student in the diagnosis and "treatment" of the individual case, but under the guidance of an experienced teacher. Because it is now possible to simulate many of these situations, or to display a selection of real cases electronically—and because the prospective teacher's efforts can be recorded, viewed, and reviewed—it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the classroom at a lower cost of time and personnel. The increase in clinical experience outside the normal school classroom makes possible the more effective utilization of such classrooms for internship and externship.

THE STANDARD

1.5 *The professional studies component includes the study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory experience.*

1.51 What evidence indicates that specific provisions have been made for the study of theory relevant to teaching (such as curriculum, evaluation, motivation, classroom management, grouping, and/or individualization of instruction)?

1.52 What practices and procedures show that the study of teaching theory requires and emphasizes laboratory experiences (observations, demonstrations, problem-solving projects, and/or other direct experiential activities)?

1.53 What evidence exists that consideration has been given to the recommendations outlined by national organizations for the preparation of teachers?[3]

1.54 What data confirm that the programs of all prospective teachers include this aspect of the professional studies component?

1.55 What procedures are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction in this aspect of the professional studies component?

THE STANDARD

1.6 *The professional studies component includes the study of teaching and learning theory with clinical experience in generic teaching situations.*

1.61 What are the provisions for including clinical experience in the professional studies component?

1.62 What data demonstrate that all prospective teachers systematically study typical teaching situations, actual or simulated, under the supervision of an experienced staff member?

1.63 What evidence indicates that consideration has been given to the recommendations on this aspect of teacher education made by national professional organizations?[4]

1.64 What procedures are used to evaluate the effectiveness of this aspect of the professional studies component?

1.7 The Professional Studies Component: Practice[5]

Internship is the trial period during which theory and rules are tested in a classroom and school, where the student has substantial responsibility and control for the full range of teaching duties. Internship is a testing in a real school situation of all the other aspects of the professional component; it is not a substitute for them. It is a more concrete and complete learning activity than observation, laboratory exercises, or clinical experience, and presupposes them.

THE STANDARD

1.17 *The professional studies component includes direct substantial participation in teaching over extended periods of time under the supervision of qualified personnel.*

1.71 What evidence is there that every prospective teacher has an opportunity to assume the full responsibility of a classroom teacher in internship?

1.72 What systematic method of recording or describing the teaching performance of the student is used which enables students and staff members to analyze the extent to which teaching behavior is consistent with the theory that has been taught?

---

[3] See footnote, p. 14.

[4] See footnote, p. 14.

[5] The term "practice" refers to "student teaching," "internship," and "externship." The term here used will be internship.

1.73 What information indicates that the institution selects and uses high quality cooperating schools for internships?

1.74 What evidence is there that the supervising teachers in the schools utilized for internships are superior teachers, and professional persons trained in supervision, and committed to the task of educating teachers?

1.75 What evidence shows that the relationship between professional personnel in the institution and in the cooperating schools contributes positively to the effective operation of internships?

1.76 What information shows that the supervision of internships is carried on by qualified personnel from the institutions?

1.77 What is the supervisory load for each teacher education staff member?

1.78 What evidence indicates that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations made by national professional bodies for internships?[6]

1.8 Role of Research in the Program

Research was not included as a separate element in the professional studies component for several reasons. First, there seems to be some doubt as to how much research a student in a basic program could do or ought to be asked to do. Second, many of the recommendations for the various components of the program assume that the results of research will figure prominently in the experience of the student, e.g., instruction in various aspects of educational theory. Nonetheless, there should be provisions for making sure that the prospective teacher will be made aware of the basic nature of educational research and will learn how to read and interpret the results of such research within the field of specialization.

In addition, the institution periodically will engage in research on its own program to ascertain whether its present practices are the most effective means for accomplishing its purposes.

THE STANDARD

1.8 *The program reflects an awareness of research and development in teacher education.*

1.81 In what ways do the prescribed studies, procedures, and overall design of the teacher education program give evidence of embodying research findings?

1.82 What means are used to test the student's ability to interpret and use research literature?

1.83 What activities indicate that the institution has or is engaged in research on its own program? What evidence shows that the research is more than "trying out something new"?

1.9 Control of the Program

Administrative structure exists primarily as a practical arrangement for fixing responsibility, utilizing resources, and achieving goals; this is also true of administrative units responsible for the preparation of teachers. It is expected that the particular unit within the institution, officially designated as responsible for teacher education, has appropriate experience, preparation, and commitment to teacher education to accept and discharge this responsibility. Such a unit or body as referred to in the standard below means a council, commission, committee, department, school, college, or other recognizable organizational entity.

THE STANDARD

1.9 *The primary responsibility for the design, approval, and continuous evaluation of the instructional program of teacher education lies with an officially designated professional body or unit within the institution.*

1.91 Is the majority of the membership of the official body made up of staff members significantly involved in the education of teachers?

1.92 What evidence exists that the members of the official body have an understanding of and concern for school needs and problems?

1.93 What activities of the official body during the past two years demonstrate that it has assumed responsibility for the design, approval, and continuous evaluation of the instructional program of teacher education?

1.94 What evidence allows one to infer that the execution of all teacher education programs is in accord with the officially approved policies?

●

2. Faculty for Teacher Education

2.1 Size and Quality of Faculty

The size and quality of the faculty are crucial factors in the program of teacher education, not only for the instructional program as such, but also for the total atmosphere in which the program is carried out. Above all the standards of the program and the degree to which they are maintained depend largely on the faculty. In the standards that follow emphasis is placed on the formal preparation, scholarly activity, and specialized competence of staff, not because these are the sole factors involved in the quality of personnel, but because they are the important relevant factors of which objective estimates are available.

---

[6] See footnote, p. 14.

The standard (2.1) assumes that advanced graduate work in a well defined field of specialization is the minimal requirement that can safely be made for work in a collegiate institution. The distribution of faculty specialization called for by the standard is related to the several elements within the professional studies component of the program as outlined in standards 1.2 to 1.7.

THE STANDARD

2.1 *Every institution has a full-time faculty in education prepared at the graduate level (beyond the master's degree) with appropriate specializations. Such specializations should make possible competent instruction in the foundational studies (behavioral and humanistic), in teaching-learning theory, and in the teaching of each of the fields for which the institution prepares teachers. There should likewise be appropriate specializations to ensure competent supervision of all laboratory, clinical, and internship experiences.*

2.11 What data indicate that there is a faculty for teacher education with qualifications sufficient to cover the instruction in the specified areas of the professional studies component?

2.12 What evidence is there that all courses and other learning experiences in the specified areas of the professional studies component are actually conducted by teachers appropriately prepared to do so?

2.2 Preparation of Faculty

Quality of faculty may be established on the basis of academic preparation, scholarly performance, or both. Scholarly competence is judged by publication, research, and/or recognition by the professional organization of the faculty member's field of specialization.

An institution will capitalize on the academic and professional strength of faculty by assignments which permit maximum use of preparation and experience. An institution may also relate its criteria for faculty selection and assignment to faculty performance and satisfaction.

THE STANDARD

2.2 *Each teacher education faculty member teaches only in the field in which he has had graduate study at a regionally accredited or recognized foreign institution, or in which he has demonstrated a scholarly competence.*

2.21 What data are available to show the relationship, over the last two years, of the teaching assignments of each faculty member in teacher education to his field of advanced preparation and his scholarly competence?

2.22 If any faculty members have been teaching outside their fields of scholarly competence, for how long and for what special reasons has this been permitted?

2.3 Faculty Load

Because the faculty is a major determinant in the quality of a teacher education program, the institution has a plan for the efficient use of faculty competence, time, and energy. There are maximum limits for teaching loads. Adjustments are made in teaching loads when nonteaching duties are assigned. Time is allotted to permit the faculty member to do the planning involved in carrying out his assigned responsibilities. Time is made available so that he can continue his scholarly development.

THE STANDARD

2.3 *The load (all services rendered) of each teacher education faculty member is such that he can study, plan, and otherwise prepare for his assigned responsibilities, and continue his scholarly development.*

2.31 Is there a plan for equating all professional duties and activities of the staff into an index of faculty load?

2.32 What is the assigned professional load (all services rendered) of each faculty member?

2.33 To what extent and for what reasons do the loads of any faculty members deviate from established institutional policy for faculty load?

2.34 For how many faculty members in teacher education, if any, has the assigned teaching load exceeded twelve semester hours (or the equivalent) during the past two years?

2.35 What evidence is there that the teaching load is reduced to the extent that other nonteaching responsibilities are assigned?

2.36 To what extent have faculty members, during the last two years, engaged in professional and scholarly activities beyond their assigned duties?

2.37 What program does the institution have for long-range faculty development (such as sabbatical leaves, summer leaves, and/or fellowships), and to what extent is it operative?

2.4 Part-Time Faculty

Two kinds of situations seem to justify the employment of faculty on a part-time basis. One is the need of the institution for a special competence not represented on the full-time staff. The other is the need for additional service in areas of competence already represented on the full-time staff. For this reason the standard does not stipulate that part-time appointments be made only as a last resort. However, the hazards possible in part-time appointments should be guarded against. For example, a part-time assignment may be added to an already full work load carried on by the appointee outside of the institution; the involvement of the part-time staff in the life and governance of the institution may be minimal; the involvement with students may also be limited.

THE STANDARD

2.4 *Part-time faculty meet minimum requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty and are employed when they can make a special contribution to the teacher education program.*

2.41 What proportion of the teacher education program has been assigned to part-time faculty?
2.42 What are the qualifications of the part-time faculty members in teacher education?
2.43 What are the loads, within and outside the institution, for all part-time faculty members in teacher education?
2.44 What reasons support the utilization of each part-time faculty member in teacher education?
2.45 What evidence shows that part-time faculty are used in those segments of the teacher education program that need them especially?
2.46 How are part-time faculty members oriented to the basic purposes of the teacher education program?

2.5 Faculty Involvement with Schools

Faculty members who are instructing prospective teachers need to have continuing involvement with school environments so that their teaching and research will be current and relevant to the problems of the schools.

Furthermore, the commitment of a teacher education faculty is to the needs of the profession as well as to institutional programs. Elementary- and secondary-school personnel assume that they share with faculty members in colleges and universities a common purpose and interest, and view with respect the specialized talent of the college staff. An institution committed to teacher education in its entirety will therefore, within its resources, provide in-service assistance to the schools in the area which it serves.

THE STANDARD

2.5 *Members of the teacher education faculty should have continuing involvement with elementary and secondary schools.*

2.51 In what ways have members of the faculty for teacher education been associated with, and involved in, activities of elementary and secondary schools?
2.52 Is there evidence to show that such association and involvement is reflected in the instructional program?
2.53 What evidence is there to indicate that the special strengths of the teacher education faculty are reflected in the services offered to the schools?

●

3. Students in Teacher Education

3.1 Admission to Teacher Education Programs

Students seeking admission to a program of teacher education may have to meet requirements in addition to those needed to enroll in the institution, because there are skills, understandings, and personal characteristics which are unique to teaching. It is assumed in the standard that not every college student can become a teacher.

THE STANDARD

3.1 *Students admitted to a program of teacher education meet specific requirements for participation in the program.*

3.11 What are the requirements for admission to the teacher education program in addition to those required for admission to the institution?
3.12 What rationale supports these requirements?
3.13 Is there evidence to show that the admission requirements are being applied?
3.14 How many students applied for admission to teacher education during each of the last two years? How many students were denied admission?
3.15 How many students who were rejected during the past two years have subsequently been admitted, and for what reasons?

3.2 Use of National Norms

It is recognized that no single criterion for the admission of students can predict success or failure infallibly, and this applies to scores on objective tests as well as to more subjective criteria. Nevertheless, scores on standardized tests are useful in predicting the probability of success in the program of studies prescribed for teacher education, and there is reason to believe that institutions ought not to rely solely on subjective criteria. The standard that follows assumes that institutions will use a number of criteria for admission and therefore mentions only standardized test scores.

THE STANDARD

3.2 *Defined or established national norms of tests are used in determining eligibility for admission to teacher education.*

3.21 What data, tests, and norms are being used as a basis of selection for admission to the teacher education program?

3.22 What formula is used to weigh the various criteria for admission?

3.23 What is the rationale for the formula used?

3.24 What justification does the institution offer if it admits students who score at various points (e.g., 40th, 30th, 20th percentiles) below the 50th percentile on nationally normed tests?

3.3 Screening on the Basis of Academic Achievement

The nature of the professional studies component of the teacher education program calls for a high order of academic achievement and growth in technical competence. Grades in course work provide the usual measures of achievement in theoretical work; reports and other modes of evaluation furnish measures of more direct experiences with the various phases of the program. The institution owes it to the student to determine as objectively and systematically as possible specific strengths and weaknesses as they affect his continuing in the program.

THE STANDARD

3.3 *The institution takes into account at regular intervals the achievement of the prospective teacher in each area of the professional studies component as a basis for his continuing in the program.*

3.31 What objective means are used to evaluate achievement in each area of the professional studies component of the program?

3.32 What data other than course grades are used to measure achievement?

3.33 What grade point average in each area of the professional studies component is required for students to continue in the program?

3.34 What justification is given for continuing students in the teacher education program who score at various points below the 50th percentile on nationally normed tests, or who are below a 2.0 (on a 4-point scale) grade point average?

3.4 Screening on the Basis of Personality Characteristics

While the academic competence of the teacher is a major determinant in effective teaching, it is not the only determinant. Prospective teachers should demonstrate personal characteristics which will contribute to rather than detract from their performance in the classroom. It is assumed in the standard that the institution has the right and the obligation to consider factors other than academic achievement as a basis for permitting a student to continue in a teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

3.4 *The institution engages in a process of continuous selection whereby only those candidates who demonstrate personal characteristics appropriate to the requirements of teaching will be permitted to continue in the program.*

3.41 On the basis of what characteristics does the institution screen students out of the program?

3.42 How many students have been removed from the teacher education program during the past two years, if any, and for what reasons?

3.43 What evidence exists that students are aware of the various reasons for which they may be dropped from the program?

3.5 Student Personnel Services

Students planning to be teachers need qualified counselors and advisors to help them assess their strengths and weaknesses and to assist them in planning their program of studies and activities in light of such assessment. They need to be informed about professional organizations and agencies as well as current school problems.

They also need to know about the wide variety of options available to them in teaching. It is therefore the obligation of an institution to have a systematic means for providing such aid and information to prospective teachers.

THE STANDARD

3.5 *The institution has a well-defined plan of counseling and advising prospective teachers.*

3.51 What evidence indicates that counseling services are readily available to every prospective teacher?

3.52 What information shows that counselors and advisors are competent persons—that is, persons who know the nature and scope of the teaching profession, the problems of the schools, and the institutional resources available to students?

3.53 How many prospective teachers have been referred by counselors or advisors to other specialized personnel within the institution during the past two years, and for what reasons?

3.54 For how many advisees is each advisor responsible?

3.55 To what extent does the institution maintain a comprehensive system of records for all prospective teachers which is readily and easily available to faculty members and placement officers for professional purposes?

3.6 Student Involvement in the Teacher Education Program

As constituents of the college community, prospective teachers should feel free, individually and collectively, to express their views on the teacher education program. They should, through their own organizations, through joint student-faculty groups, or as representatives to faculty committees, have clear channels and frequent opportunities to communicate their views on the adequacy and development of the teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

3.6 *The institution makes provision for the expression of views of prospective teachers on the teacher education program.*

3.61 What evidence shows that students are consulted by the faculty and administration on matters relating to the teacher education program?

3.62 What evidence is there that the college protects the right of the student to take reasoned exception to the views presented in any course in the teacher education program?

3.63 What are the major concerns which students in teacher education have expressed about the program during the past two years?

●

4. Resources and Facilities for Teacher Education

4.1 The Library

The quality of both the general and professional components of the program for teacher education is reflected in the scope and depth of the library holdings. As a principal instructional resource, the library holdings in education must be adequate for the number of students to be served and pertinent to the kind and level of programs offered. The accession rate must be sufficient to assure that the quality of the collection is maintained. In addition to providing a collection of materials, library service must assure both students and faculty access to the materials.

THE STANDARD

4.1 *The library, as the principal materials resource center of the institution, is adequate for the instructional, research, and other services pertinent to its teacher education program.*

4.11 Are standard and contemporary holdings in education—books, microfilms, microfiche copies—included in the library?

4.12 Are standard periodicals in education available to prospective teachers?

4.13 Are such additional books and periodicals as are needed to support the total teacher education program provided?

4.14 What evidence is there that books, periodicals, and other materials in teacher education reflect the recommendations of a nationally recognized list or lists?

4.15 What evidence demonstrates that the recommendations of instructional departments for the acquisition of books, periodicals, and other materials have been met?

4.16 What is the annual record of library expenditures for the total library and for education during the past five years?

4.17 Do both students and faculty have access to and use the library holdings?

4.2 The Materials and Instructional Media Center

Equipment and resource materials in support of teaching have been developed extensively and improved markedly. A program for preparing teachers should make use of such equipment and materials in two important ways: prospective teachers should know how to make use of modern technologies in teaching, and modern technologies should be utilized in the teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

4.2 *A materials and instructional media center for teacher education is maintained either as a part of the library or as one or more separate units.*

4.21 To what extent is the center adequate to support the program of teacher education offered?

4.22 Does the center contain equipment and materials which:
- a. can be utilized at different grade levels?
- b. are representative of all areas in the curriculum?
- c. reflect recent developments in the teaching of the various subject fields?
- d. illustrate the wide array of available instructional media (such as films, filmstrips, realia, audio-video tapes, transparencies, teaching machines, and closed-circuit TV)?

4.23 Is the center directed by personnel who are well informed in the various instructional media and materials at different grade levels?

4.24 Is the center available to and used by students and faculty?

4.25 What evidence shows that the available instructional media are being used in the teacher education program itself?

4.26 What evidence shows that the recommendations from instructional departments for the acquisition of materials for the center have been met?

4.3 Physical Facilities

Although physical facilities are not the main determinants of the quality of a program of an institution, each component of the program does entail the use of buildings and equipment, and some of the professional components make special demands on space and equipment. Moreover, the requirements of students and faculty for appropriate study, research, and living space cannot be reduced to the point where these activities lose their effectiveness. Because of the great variation in institutions the standard does not attempt to quantify its recommendation on physical facilities. It does not, however, counsel that each institution's facilities be adequate to its own program, because the program may not be adequate. The standard assumes that given an acceptable program, the adequacy of the physical facilities can be judged in terms of the operational requirements of that program.

THE STANDARD

4.3 *The institution provides the physical facilities essential to the instructional and professional activities of an acceptable teacher education program.*

4.31 What facts indicate that faculty have office space and other spaces which are necessary to carry out their responsibilities?

4.32 To what extent are the available spaces and equipment adequate to accommodate each student in the teacher education program?

4.33 In what ways does the availability and allotment of space and equipment facilitate or hinder the carrying out of faculty and administrative responsibility?

4.34 To what extent have requests from instructional departments for improvements in physical facilities been honored?

4.4 Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources

Institutions of higher education, especially multi-purpose institutions, have human, instructional, physical, and financial resources that can be used by many units within the institution. For example, a university may support psychological clinics, speech clinics, language laboratories, specialized libraries, child development centers, computer centers, and similar facilities that could be of use in the teacher education program. An institution thoroughly committed to teacher education will make such resources available to it. However, the faculty for teacher education will need to discern the potential of such resources and to devise means for actualizing this potential.

THE STANDARD

4.4 *The diverse resources of the institution are available and used in support of teacher education.*

4.41 What potential resources in the institution (such as psychological clinics, speech clinics, language laboratories, specialized libraries, child development centers, and/or computer centers), if any, are unavailable for use to support the teacher education program?

4.42 What potential resources for teacher education in the institution are available for use but are not being used?

4.5 Clerical and Supporting Services

The major asset of an institution for preparing teachers is its faculty—their experience, their preparation, their commitment to teacher education, and their performance. If faculty are dissipating their professional energies on subprofessional tasks, the quality of the instructional program is being compromised, and the institution is not receiving a good return for its investments in faculty. Clerical and supporting services are therefore essential to permit the faculty to fulfill their instructional and other professional responsibilities.

THE STANDARD

4.5 *The faculty for teacher education is provided with essential clerical and other supporting services.*

4.51 What is the plan and the rationale for allocating clerical and supporting services to the staff?

4.52 What provisions are made for supplying and reproducing instructional materials (such as transparencies, films, filmstrips, audiotapes, and/or videotapes)?

4.53 To what extent have requests from the teacher education faculty for clerical and other supporting services been honored?

●

5. Evaluation

5.1 Evaluation of Graduates

No institution takes its commitment to prepare teachers seriously unless it tries to arrive at an honest evaluation of the quality of its graduates and those persons being recommended for professional certification.

The phrase "teachers it has prepared" in the standard may refer to students who have just completed the program or to teachers who completed the program at various times in the past. It is to be noted that the tasks of evaluating these two groups of "teachers it has prepared" are not identical.

It is recognized that the present means for making such evaluations are inadequate, and that there is an emerging interest on the part of institutions in the development of more adequate means. It is assumed in the standard not only that institutions should be evaluating the teachers it has prepared with the best means now available, but also that they should be developing improved means to make such evaluations.

THE STANDARD

5.1 *The institution has evidence of the quality of the teachers it has prepared.*

5.11 What means are now being used by the institution to evaluate the teachers it has prepared?

5.12 What procedures are being used to determine that prospective teachers at the time of graduation are competent in both components of the teacher education program (general studies and professional studies)?

5.13 What evidence indicates that the institution is keeping abreast of new developments in the evaluation of the teachers it has prepared?

5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Programs

Good evaluations of the teachers not only provide assessments, but also suggest new directions and areas in the program which need strengthening. It is assumed in the standard that the results from such evaluations will be reflected in appropriate modifications of the preparation program.

THE STANDARD

5.2 *The institution uses the results obtained from evaluating the teachers it has prepared in the study, development, and improvement of its teacher education program.*

5.21 What have the results of an evaluation of the teachers prepared by the institution revealed about the program?

5.22 What changes, if any, have been made in the teacher education program resulting from such evidence?

5.3 Long-Range Planning

It is customary for an institution to project plans for its future development. Long-range plans provide a basis for making decisions in such matters as increasing or limiting enrollment, introducing new programs, expanding present programs, or entering the field of graduate education. It is expected that the institution's projected plans will take into account the development of its teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

5.3 *The institution has a long-range plan for its development and incorporates therein a plan for the development of its teacher education program.*

5.31 What significant changes in teacher education, if any, are projected in the institution's long-range plans?

5.32 What evidence shows that the faculty for teacher education has participated in the formulation of the institution's long-range plans?

PART II: ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Programs Beyond the Master's Level for the Advanced Preparation of Teachers and Programs Beyond the Baccalaureate Level for the Preparation of Specialized School Personnel.

G-1. Instructional Program

G-1.1 Purpose of Advanced Programs

Graduate study in any field is directed toward advanced and more specialized phases of a field than is undergraduate instruction. Traditionally, graduate study is intended to give the student greater independence in carrying on his studies. The graduate student, moreover, is supposed to become familiar with the methods of inquiry within a limited domain, its major problems, and its key literatures. For these reasons, advanced programs in education demand far more in the way of scholarly specialists than do basic programs, and a smaller proportion of their time can be commanded for purely instructional duties.

In the field of education, advanced study may be undertaken for specialized competence in the study of education itself, or it may be undertaken to prepare the student for a specialized role in the school system or for the improvement of the student as a teacher. The standards that follow address themselves primarily to programs that prepare personnel who for the most part will work in the elementary and secondary schools.

THE STANDARD

G-1.1 *The programs of graduate study in education are designed to prepare professional school personnel for advanced teaching competence or specialized functions.*

G-1.1 For what professional school position does each graduate program prepare personnel (school superintendent, principal, supervisor, specialist, teacher, and/or other positions)?

G-1.2 What evidence indicates that each graduate program requires courses or other learning experiences which bear directly on the position for which the candidate seeks preparation?

G-1.2 Content of Advanced Programs

Because of the variety of outcomes for which advanced programs of study are instituted, their contents cannot be prescribed with any significant degree of specificity. By and large the content is dictated by the requirements of the professional role for which the student is trying to qualify. As in other professional fields, the appropriate information and theory are drawn from more than one intellectual discipline, and the student is expected to develop familiarity with theory and technical skill. However, there are understandings and contexts that all professional workers in education share, and the standard assumes that such understandings will constitute a core of content common to all advanced programs in education.

THE STANDARD

G-1.2 *Each graduate study program in education includes general and specialized content which relates appropriately to the professional school functions for which candidates are being prepared.*

G-1.21 What is the rationale for having, or not having, a common core for all graduate programs in education?

G-1.22 In what ways are the general and specialized content clearly differentiated by type of program?

G-1.23 What data indicate that candidates for degrees in each professional program have completed the prescribed general and specialized content for the respective programs?

G-1.24 What evidence demonstrates that programs which prepare personnel for specific professional positions have embodied the recommendations of professional organizations and practitioners?[1]

G-1.25 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction of the general and specialized content for the respective programs?

---

[1] A number of professional associations and learned societies have as one of their major interests the improvement of teacher education. Some of these organizations have developed guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel in their respective specialization fields. It is assumed that each institution will develop the rationale for its various programs in teacher education with due consideration for the recommendations in these guidelines.

During 1968-69 a number of pilot institutions will be engaged in testing the proposed standards. AACTE will provide a list of the most useful guidelines for these institutions as they study their programs in preparation for an NCATE evaluation.

Eventually, AACTE may assume the responsibility of publishing such a list annually for wider distribution.

G-1.3 Direct and/or Simulated Experiences

All advanced programs in education of reasonable quality are intellectually challenging. Professional programs offered at the advanced level have yet another vital dimension: they must be concerned with professional performance. Such programs therefore include real or simulated experiences. By means of these experiences, the student tests the theoretical framework which he is constructing as a basis for professional performance.

THE STANDARD

G-1.3 *Each advanced program in education includes direct and/or simulated experiences (laboratory, clinical, practicum, assistantship, and/or internship) which relate specifically to the school position for which the candidate is being prepared.*

G-1.31 In what ways are the direct or simulated experiences clearly differentiated by type of program?

G-1.32 What data show that candidates for degrees in each professional program have completed the prescribed direct or simulated experiences for the respective programs?

G-1.33 What evidence is there that the prescribed direct or simulated experiences contribute positively to the preparation of personnel for specific professional positions?

G-1.34 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of the supervision of these experiences?

G-1.35 What information confirms that advanced programs which prepare personnel for specific school positions have embodied the recommendations of professional organizations and practitioners?[2]

G-1.4 Role of Research

Research in any discipline or field constitutes an organized effort to solve problems, advance knowledge, and test theories. Every teacher—and all supporting personnel who hold graduate degrees—needs to have continuous access to research findings, to know how to understand and evaluate them, and to demonstrate skill in adapting them to professional needs.

Under the term "research" are usually included courses in research methodology, statistics, and experimental design. However, field study of various types, studies of completed research, and computated analysis of research findings are also covered by the term. The type of research training varies with the type of degree being offered and relevance of the research training being offered. However, the type of research training required for a degree also should be judged by its relevance to the kind of professional work for which the candidate is preparing. In the light of these considerations it would seem that the research required for a nonresearch degree should stress the understanding and use of research findings more than the designing and conducting of research.

THE STANDARD

G-1.4 *Graduate programs of study in education require an understanding of research and the use of research findings.*

G-1.41 What provisions are made for including the research component in the graduate programs offered?

G-1.42 How are the requirements for the research component differentiated by level of degree?

G-1.43 What differentiations are made in the requirements for the research component by type of program?

G-1.44 What data show that the programs of students meet the requirements for the research component?

G-1.45 What means are used to test the student's ability to understand and use research literature?

G-1.5 Individualization of Programs of Study

Because of its highly specialized character, graduate instruction is concerned with the particular strengths and weaknesses of each student. This is especially the case in graduate programs in education, because people from many different disciplinary backgrounds enter it. Aside from such requirements as are common to all graduate programs the greatest flexibility for individual programs is desirable.

THE STANDARD

G-1.5 *Graduate programs of study in education permit individual professional needs and interests to be met.*

G-1.51 What procedures are used to ascertain the professional needs and interests of each candidate?

G-1.52 What evidence shows that programs of study have been designed to meet individual professional needs and interests?

---

[2] See footnote, p. 24.

G-1.6 Quality of Graduate Study: Graduate Credit

If advanced programs in education are to prepare personnel for greater—and often more specialized—responsibilities within the profession, they must require a level of performance far beyond that required for the beginning professional. Graduate study is built upon but goes beyond initial academic and professional achievement.

THE STANDARD

G-1.6 *Graduate credit is not offered for study which is remedial or which is designed to remove deficiencies in preparation for entrance into advanced programs.*

G-1.61 What regulations govern the granting of graduate credit?

G-1.62 Is graduate credit offered for study which is remedial or designed to remove deficiencies in preparation for entrance?

G-1.63 Is there evidence to demonstrate adherence to these regulations?

G-1.7 Quality of Graduate Study: Enrollment in Courses

The character of graduate instruction is greatly influenced by the more mature status and the professional motivation of graduate students. While there may be many good reasons for admitting undergraduate students to some graduate courses, it is assumed in the standard that for substantial portions of time in advanced programs, graduate students will be in instructional groups from which undergraduates are excluded.

THE STANDARD

G-1.7 *At least one-half of the courses and seminars in each advanced program in education are courses which exclude undergraduate students.*

G-1.71 What is the proportion of undergraduate or graduate courses required and/or permitted in each advanced program?

G-1.72 What data show that at least one-half of the courses and seminars completed by graduate students in each advanced program are at a level from which undergraduates have been excluded?

G-1.8 Quality of Graduate Study: Residence Requirement

Sporadic efforts, part-time study, and on-the-job distractions retard one's progress toward achieving the goals of graduate study. One of the major features of advanced graduate study is that students learn from each other and close association with the faculty in a climate that stimulates research and scholarly effort. This is not possible unless the student spends a substantial block of time in full-time residence at the institution.

THE STANDARD

G-1.8 *At least one academic year of full-time residence study is required for candidates pursuing the doctorate.*

G-1.81 What is the institution's regulation concerning full-time residence study for the doctorate?

G-1.82 Is there information to show that candidates who have completed the doctorate during the past two years were in full-time residence for at least one academic year?

G-1.83 Is there evidence that each graduate assistantship enhances the program of study of the student holding the assistantship?

G-1.9 Control of the Program

Because the quality of the graduate program depends so directly and heavily on the quality of the faculty and students and on the content and design of the several programs, the graduate school needs a structure by which the faculty can control every phase of the program. It is important that procedures for admissions, program planning, new courses, hiring of staff, and requirements for degrees be carefully organized and systematized, and that faculty be involved in the formation and execution of both policy and procedures.

THE STANDARD

G-1.9 *The primary responsibility for initiation, development, and implementation of graduate programs in education lies with the education faculty.*

G-1.91 How are graduate programs initiated? What bodies approve changes and new programs?

G-1.92 What evidence indicates that the education faculty has initiated and/or developed graduate programs during the past two years?

G-1.93 Which programs leading to professional degrees, if any, are not approved by the education faculty?

G-2. Faculty for Advanced Programs in Education

G-2.1 Qualifications of Faculty: Experience and Scholarly Competence

An adequate graduate faculty in education is distinguished by a high order of specialization, active scholarship, and original research. This means not only that the staff has a high level of formal training, but also that it has appropriate experience to support the respective specialization areas. The institution supports the faculty by providing time, opportunity, and a favorable climate for study and research. A graduate program of even minimal acceptable quality therefore is more costly in terms of staff time, space, and equipment per student than is the typical undergraduate program.

THE STANDARD

G-2.1 *The education faculty conducting graduate programs have experience and scholarly competence in the fields of specialization in which they are teaching and conducting research.*

G-2.11 In what field experiences has each member of the graduate education faculty engaged during the past five years? To what extent have these experiences supported teaching and research assignments in his area of specialization?

G-2.12 What writing, research, and consultation has each member of the graduate education faculty done during the past two years? To what extent have these activities supported the teaching assignment in his area of specialization?

G-2.2 Qualifications of Faculty: Academic Preparation

Exceptions to the principle of graduate faculty holding the doctor's degree should be made only in unusual cases; then only when a staff member—by virtue of publication, research, or recognition by the professional organization of his field of specialization—has demonstrated his competence for independent scholarly activity.

THE STANDARD

G-2.2 *The education faculty members teaching at the master's level hold the doctorate or have demonstrated competence with study in each field of specialization in which they are teaching; the faculty members teaching at the advanced level (sixth year and doctoral) hold the doctorate with study in each field of specialization in which they are teaching and conducting research.*

G-2.21 What data show that each faculty member teaching at the master's level holds the doctorate from a regionally accredited institution or a recognized foreign university, or has demonstrated competence in his field of specialization?

G-2.22 What information shows that each faculty member teaching at the advanced level (sixth year and doctoral) holds the doctorate from a regionally accredited or recognized foreign institution?

G-2.23 What evidence indicates that each faculty member has taken the basic courses at a regionally accredited or recognized foreign institution which qualify him to teach in his field or fields of specialization?

G-2.24 Does each faculty member have writings, research, or experience which qualifies him to teach in his field of specialization?

G-2.3 Quality and Size of Faculty in Education

A doctoral program requires a faculty which not only includes a specialist for each field of specialization in which a degree is offered, but in addition, a cluster of specialists in complementary fields to support each degree program. If this cluster is too small, students are unlikely to receive the benefits of the best work being done in the field, and the institution may find it difficult, if not impossible, to provide the research climate and activity necessary for work at the doctoral level.

THE STANDARD

G-2.3 *The faculty in education offering a doctorate includes at least one full-time person with specialization in the field in which a degree is offered, and five persons who hold the doctorate in complementary fields for each specialization field.*

G-2.31 What information shows that there is at least one person with appropriate specialization for each field in which a graduate degree is offered?

G-2.32 If the institution offers any specializations (leading to a degree) which are not supported by a full-time faculty member qualified in the appropriate specialization area, for how long has this been done, and for what reasons?

G-2.33 What information confirms that there are at least five persons who hold doctorates in complementary fields for each specialization in which a graduate degree is offered?

G-2.34 If the institution offers any specializations (leading to a degree) which are not supported by five persons who hold the doctorate in complementary fields, for how long has this been done, and for what reasons?

G-2.4 Part-Time Faculty

The high degree of specialization entailed by graduate instruction makes it both appropriate and tempting to utilize part-time faculty. Highly successful professionals can often bring valuable strength to the graduate program in education, and frequently the demand for a given course may be too small to warrant the employment of a full-time staff member. The problem is to prevent the fragmentation of instruction and erosion of standards that often accompany the over-utilization of part-time faculty.

THE STANDARD

G-2.4 *The part-time faculty in education in the graduate program meet the same requirements as the full-time faculty.*

G-2.41 What proportion of each graduate program in education has been assigned to part-time faculty?

G-2.42 What data show that the qualifications of the part-time faculty members meet the same requirements as the full-time faculty?

G-2.43 What are the loads, within and outside the institution, for all part-time faculty members in education in the graduate program?

G-2.44 What reasons support the utilization of each part-time faculty member in education in the graduate program?

G-2.5 Faculty Load

Institutions undertaking new programs of graduate instruction tend to underestimate the amount of time a graduate staff member needs to devote to the supervision and counseling of students, independent study, travel, publication, and program development. These activities cannot be added to a classroom teaching load which, for undergraduate instruction, would be regarded as standard.

THE STANDARD

G-2.5 *In calculating a graduate faculty member's total responsibilities the institution provides time for the supervision of graduate students and their research as well as for other nonteaching duties.*

G-2.51 What is the plan for equating all professional duties and activities of the graduate staff in education into an index of faculty load?

G-2.52 What is the policy for assigning faculty load for chairing dissertations?

G-2.53 How many doctoral students in education are working on theses and to whom are they assigned?

G-2.54 What is the total load of chairing dissertations carried by each faculty member in education?

G-2.55 What is the ratio of teaching load for undergraduate and graduate programs?

G-2.56 How does the ratio of total student semester hours earned for each full-time graduate professor in education compare with data from other colleges in the university?

G-2.57 Does the assigned teaching load of any graduate faculty member in education exceed nine semester hours (or the equivalent)?

G-2.58 What evidence demonstrates that the teaching load is reduced to the extent that other nonteaching responsibilities are assigned?

G-2.59 To what extent have faculty members in education, during the last two years, engaged in professional and scholarly activities beyond their assigned load?

G-2.6 Faculty Involvement in Research

Graduate faculty in education are involved in research to contribute to the solution of educational problems, to expand the field of knowledge in education, and to provide a model for student learning. In order to capitalize maximally on its faculty resources, an institution encourages involvement in research by allocating time and support to make such involvement possible.

THE STANDARD

G-2.6 *The institution provides opportunity and necessary support of the faculty to permit involvement in research.*

G-2.61 What is the institution's policy regarding the provision of time for faculty to do research?[3]

G-2.62 Is there evidence that this policy is being implemented?

●

G-3. Students in Advanced Programs in Education

G-3.1 Admission to Advanced Programs in Education

Students enter advanced programs in education at various points in their careers for a variety of reasons, and from a variety of academic backgrounds. Moreover, different fields of specialization require varying clusters of ability: some are more theoretical than others; some place more emphasis on personal relations than do others. Thus, there can be no single set of admission requirements for all programs.

Some institutions have, by experience, arrived at norms on national tests and undergraduate records which have high predictive power for success in *their* programs. This wide range of variation is no excuse for abandoning selective admission and relying upon long trial or probationary admission to graduate standing. On the contrary, the variations make it imperative to base admissions on a careful study of the individual applicant.

THE STANDARD

G-3.1 *Students are admitted to advanced programs in education on the basis of evidence which (a) shows the pertinence of their professional objectives to the programs selected, (b) confirms the adequacy of educational background necessary for advanced study, and (c) indicates the likelihood of successful completion of the program.*

G-3.11 What are the admission requirements for the advanced programs in education offered?

G-3.12 To what extent is successful past experience considered as a basis for admission to the advanced programs?

G-3.13 What objective data including national norms are used as a basis to predict the success of students in the advanced programs?

G-3.14 What information indicates that admission to advanced programs is based on the quality of undergraduate work taken in a regionally or nationally accredited institution?

G-3.15 What evidence establishes that the institution's requirements for admission to advanced programs are being met?

G-3.2 Screening of Students

A high concentration of mediocre students will depress the standards of even the best graduate program. Moreover, the cost of graduate instruction is so high that resources should be invested primarily in students most likely to succeed in the graduate programs. Because the failing grade in graduate courses is rarely given, "satisfactory progress" has to be judged by other more subjective criteria. However, such "subjective" judgments are inadequate unless the institution has ways of formally collecting and evaluating these judgments, then translating them into a decision on the student's status.

THE STANDARD

G-3.2 *The institution maintains systematic procedures for the continuous screening of students in the advanced programs in education.*

G-3.21 What are the checkpoints for continuation in the advanced programs offered?

G-3.22 For what reasons other than academic, if any, may a student be removed from an advanced program?

G-3.23 For what reasons have students been removed from advanced programs during the past two years?

G-3.24 What is the total number of students in each advanced program offered?

G-3.25 What is the average and the range for the length of time required for students to complete a program in the graduate school?

G-3.26 What information shows that students are aware of the reasons for which they may be dropped from a program?

---

[3] Standard G-4.5 covers the provision of funds for research.

G-3.3 Supervision of Students' Programs of Study in Education

The same considerations which make admission to an advanced program a highly individualized affair also operate in the planning and supervision of each graduate student's program. The tradition of graduate study, especially doctoral, permits a high degree of flexibility on programs of study and places major responsibility for it on an official advisor and/or advisory committee. The force of this standard is bidirectional; it prevents perfunctory program making, but it also protects the flexibility needed for individualized program making.

THE STANDARD

G-3.3 *The planning and supervision of each graduate student's program of study is the official responsibility of one or more members of the graduate faculty in education.*

G-3.31 What procedures are used for providing advisors and/or committees for graduate students?

G-3.32 What evidence shows that both students and faculty members have a choice in the assignment of advisors?

G-3.33 For how many advisees, at each level of graduate study, is each graduate advisor responsible?

G-3.34 What evidence is there that each doctoral candidate's program is approved by a committee of the graduate faculty?

G-3.4 Quality of Student Body

Without a sizable cadre of first rate graduate students an institution cannot keep first rate staff who, in turn, will attract other first rate students. Since competition for high quality graduate students is very keen, an institution must be prepared to seek out these students and provide an attractive level of support for them.

THE STANDARD

G-3.4 *The institution makes a deliberate effort to seek and support a sizable number of high quality graduate students.*

G-3.41 What procedures does the institution use in recruiting and selecting high quality graduate students?

G-3.42 How many students in the advanced programs in education are supported, and what is the extent of support?

G-3.43 What data indicate that high quality students remain in and complete advanced programs in education at the institution?

●

G-4. Resources and Physical Facilities for Advanced Programs in Education

G-4.1 The Library

The adequacy of library holdings is an important factor in establishing the quality of graduate programs in education. As a principal instructional resource, the holdings in education must be adequate for the number of students and faculty to be served, and pertinent to the kind and level of graduate programs offered. Furthermore, the accession rate must be sufficient to assure the maintenance of the collection. The operation of graduate programs in education requires library resources substantially larger than those required for basic programs in teacher education.

In addition to a collection, library service must be provided to assure both students and faculty access to the materials. Independent study and research which characterize graduate study place heavy demands on both the size of the collection and the quality of library service.

THE STANDARD

G-4.1 *The library provides resources for independent graduate study and for research for each of the advanced programs in education offered by the institution.*

G-4.11 What data show that standard and contemporary holdings—books, microfilms, microfiche copies, periodicals—to support each advanced program offered are included in the library collection?

G-4.12 What evidence demonstrates that the institution pays responsible attention to the recommendations of a nationally recognized list or lists for books and periodicals to support the respective graduate programs?

G-4.13 What evidence indicates that the recommendations of instructional departments for acquisition of books, periodicals, and other materials have been met?

G-4.14 To what extent do graduate students have access to open stacks and carrels?

G-4.15 What is the annual record of library expenditures for the total library and for education during the past five years?

G-4.2 Physical Facilities

An institution offering a graduate program should expect to provide adequate physical facilities which will support instructional and research activities of each particular program. The extent to which physical facilities, equipment, and materials are required for graduate study depends on the particular program. If a clinical or practicum facility is needed, for example, the instructional program is obviously inadequate and incomplete without it. In addition, physical facilities, equipment, and materials should be readily accessible so as not to dissipate the energies of the faculty and the students in pursuing instructional objectives.

THE STANDARD

G-4.2 *The institution provides the physical facilities essential to the instructional and research activities of each advanced program in education.*

G-4.21 What evidence shows that there exists specialized equipment (such as open and closed circuit TV and computers) and laboratories necessary for the programs offered, and that these are used by faculty and students?

G-4.22 What information shows that faculty have office and other spaces which are necessary to carry out their responsibilities?

G-4.23 To what extent are the available spaces adequate to accommodate each student in the advanced programs offered?

G-4.24 To what extent have requests from the instructional departments in education for improvements in physical facilities been honored?

G-4.25 To what extent have recommendations by professional organizations for physical facilities been considered?[4]

G-4.26 To what extent is computer time available to graduate students for research?

G-4.3 Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources

Institutions of higher education, especially multi-purpose institutions, have human, instructional, physical, and financial resources that can be used by many units within the institution. For example, a university may support psychological clinics, speech clinics, language laboratories, specialized libraries, child development centers, computer centers, and similar facilities that could be of use in the teacher education program. An institution thoroughly committed to advanced programs in teacher education will make such resources available to them. However, the graduate faculty in education will need to discern the potential of such resources and to devise means for actualizing this potential.

THE STANDARD

G-4.3 *The diverse academic resources of the institution are available and used in support of the advanced programs in education.*

G-4.31 What machinery exists to promote better utilization of the institution's total resources for graduate study in education?

G-4.32 What needed resources of the institution which would support graduate instruction in education are not being used?

G-4.4 Clerical and Other Supporting Services

A graduate faculty, by definition, possesses advanced preparation, broad professional experience, and recognized academic and/or professional achievements. Graduate faculty are assigned relatively heavy responsibilities and are expected to be productive. Clerical and supporting services should be viewed as means of insuring that the faculty member uses his time and talent where they will count most—with students, in research, in writing, and in consultation.

---

[4] See footnote, p. 24.

THE STANDARD

G-4.4 *The graduate faculty in education is provided with essential clerical and other supporting services.*

G-4.41 What is the plan and rationale for allocating clerical and supporting services to the graduate faculty in education?

G-4.42 What provisions are made for supplying and reproducing instructional materials (such as transparencies, films, filmstrips, audiotapes, and/or videotapes)?

G-4.43 To what extent have requests from the instructional departments in education for clerical and other supporting services been honored?

G-4.5 Allocation of Funds for Research

Graduate programs require research endeavors by which graduate students learn to attack important professional problems in an organized and sophisticated manner. It is almost axiomatic that instruction in research depends upon the research interest and ability of the faculty. An institution which is seriously dedicated to graduate instruction should be willing to provide financial support for the faculty; not only for the value of the research itself, but for the contribution which research activities can make to the graduate program.

THE STANDARD

G-4.5 *An established percentage of institutional funds is available to the graduate faculty in education for research endeavors.*

G-4.51 On what basis and in what amounts are institutional funds allocated to the graduate education faculty for research?

G-4.52 What proportion of the institution's research funds are supported from outside sources?

G-4.53 To what extent have requests from the graduate faculty in education for institutional research funds been honored?

●

G-5. Evaluation

G-5.1 Evaluation of Graduates

Professional graduate programs undertake important responsibilities for assisting professional school personnel to improve and/or serve in more specialized positions. Because of this responsibility, the institution is obligated to the profession to determine periodically the quality and effectiveness of its students at, or shortly following, completion of the program. It is assumed that representatives from elementary and secondary schools would be valuable participants in such evaluations.

THE STANDARD

G-5.1 *The institution evaluates the graduates of its respective advanced programs in education.*

G-5.11 What means are now being used by the institution to evaluate the graduates of the respective advanced programs in education?

G-5.12 What new approaches, if any, are being experimented with to evaluate the graduates of the respective advanced programs in education?

G-5.13 What evidence is there that the institution is keeping abreast of new developments in the evaluation of its graduates?

G-5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Programs

An evaluation of the graduates of advanced professional programs is essential in order to determine how well the institution is fulfilling its responsibilities to the profession. The evidence of such an evaluation will provide a vital basis—perhaps the most relevant basis—for evaluating and subsequently improving the graduate programs.

THE STANDARD

G-5.2 *The institution uses the results obtained from evaluating its graduates in the study, development, and improvement of its advanced programs in education.*

G-5.21 What have the results of an evaluation of the institution's graduates revealed about the advanced programs?

G-5.22 What changes, if any, have been made in the advanced programs resulting from such evidence?

G-5.3 Long-Range Planning

It is customary for an institution to project plans for the future development of its graduate programs. Long-range plans provide a basis for making decisions about such matters as increasing or limiting enrollment, expanding and/or upgrading present programs, discontinuing inferior programs, or introducing new programs. It is expected that the institution's long-range plans will take into account the future development of the graduate programs in education.

THE STANDARD

G-5.3 *The institution has a long-range plan for its development at the graduate level and incorporates therein a plan for the development of its programs in education.*

G-5.31 What significant changes in the graduate programs of education, if any, are projected in the institution's long-range plans?

G-5.32 What evidence shows that the graduate faculty for education has participated in the formulation of the institution's long-range plans?

APPENDIX

Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

The statement which follows sets forth the STANDARDS of the Council for the accreditation of teacher education in colleges and universities. The NCATE is an organization whose sole purpose is to improve teacher education through the application of standards of accreditation. Only those qualified institutions that apply voluntarily and are found by examination to meet established standards for the preparation of teachers are accredited by the Council. An institution may be accredited at the undergraduate levels for any or all of the following categories: (a) elementary school teachers, (b) secondary school teachers, (c) school service personnel such as administrators, supervisors, and guidance counselors. If within any of these three general categories parts of the program do not meet the Standards of the Council, the institution may not be accredited for that particular category, or may be expected either to drop the deficient curriculum, or, within a reasonable time, to remedy the deficiency. An institution whose program of teacher education is generally strong and gives good promise of further development but is still deficient in certain respects may be granted provisional accreditation for a term not to exceed three years. In such cases, the institution is expected to furnish the Council with annual reports of progress in eliminating its deficiencies and will be granted full accreditation when standards are fully met.

Introductory Statement Relating to Standards

Institutions that meet the following criteria qualify for evaluation by the Council:

1. Institutions accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association at the level for which they request Council accreditation and by the appropriate state department of education for the level and categories requested.
2. Nonprofit institutions of higher learning offering not less than four years of college work leading to a bachelor's degree.
3. Institutions offering four-year curricula (a) for the preparation of elementary school teachers, or (b) for the preparation of secondary school teachers; or (c) institutions offering only graduate or advanced professional programs for school personnel when such institutions provide graduate work in other fields necessary to support these programs.

As implied in the first criterion, the Council aims to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. As rapidly as possible, therefore, the Council will cooperate with the regional and professional accrediting bodies and state departments of education in the collection of information from institutions, in the evaluation of institutions, and in reports to institutions.

The Council regards accreditation by a regional accrediting association as adequate insurance of the general financial stability of the institution, the effectiveness of the administration, the adequacy of the general facilities, the quality of the student personnel program, the appropriateness of the overall program including general education and subject-matter majors, the general strength of the faculty, the faculty personnel policies of the institution, and the quality of instruction. The Council, therefore, evaluates the teacher education program within this setting, including the teacher education objectives, the organization for teacher education, the student personnel program for teacher education, the faculty for professional education, the patterns of academic and professional courses and experiences offered in the various teacher education curricula, the facilities for the teacher education curricula offered, and the program of professional laboratory experiences. These factors will be evaluated for the total program offered in the categories for which accreditation is sought regardless of their location in the institution.

The Standards, it will be noted, are stated in terms of principles that should govern the program. Specific, quantitative standards are kept to an absolute minimum in order to allow for reasonable flexibility. Following each of the seven Standards, implications for the program are presented. Standard II, relating to the organization and administration of teacher education, provides a good illustration. The Standard specifies the principles which govern the organization. The implications characterize a satisfactory organizational structure without prescribing a pattern.

In establishing these Standards, the Council recognizes that teacher education is and can be effectively carried on in different types of colleges and universities and in a variety of patterns. In applying the Standards, therefore, due consideration is given to differences in the nature of the institution, its internal organization, and its curriculum pattern. The essential requirement is that the institution have a program for the preparation of teachers supported by a well-qualified faculty and adequate facilities.

I

Objectives of Teacher Education

STANDARD

Every institution maintaining a program of teacher education should have a written statement of its objectives. The statement should indicate the school positions for which the program prepares persons and should describe the entire scope of the effort being made by the institution to improve the quality of education in the schools. It should indicate clearly the personal and intellectual qualities which the program is designed to develop. The statement should also set forth the major beliefs and assumptions as to the most effective means of developing these desired personal and intellectual qualities. The objectives for teacher education should be consistent with the overall objectives of the institution, should be formulated by the faculty concerned with the education of teachers, should be subject to continuous review, and should be officially approved.

The manner in which all other standards are implemented should be consistent with the philosophy expressed in the statement of objectives. Moreover, the institution should constantly seek evidence of the effectiveness of its program as measured against the stated objectives. When reflected in terms of the six Standards that follow, these objectives should imply that the graduates of any curriculum are qualified for the positions for which they have been prepared. Therefore, the statement of objectives will be subject to the same evaluation as any other Standard.

Implications of Standard for Program

The statement which follows should not be regarded as a part of the Standard. Instead, it is meant to show how the Standard might be applied to this aspect of a teacher education program.

A statement of objectives will be regarded as a clear index to the program when it delineates the scope of the offerings and differentiates between the ends (objectives) and the means (beliefs and assumptions). The scope will indicate the school positions for which the institution prepares persons such as elementary teachers, secondary teachers in the various subject fields, and school service personnel (principals, guidance counselors, and superintendents) as well as the levels (bachelor's, master's, or doctor's) at which persons are prepared. The objectives will define the end products or the major factors that will be emphasized in the program (able and committed persons, a person able to work effectively with children, oral and written expression). The beliefs and assumptions will make clear how in the judgment of the faculty the objectives can best be reached (high standards and definite procedures for admission to teacher education, high scholarship standards, laboratory experiences as part of most courses in Education, a heavy requirement in composition and speech).

II

Organization and Administration of Teacher Education

STANDARD

The organization of an institution in which teachers are prepared should be such as to facilitate the planning, the administration, and the continuous improvement of a consistently unified program of teacher education. Because colleges and universities differ in overall organizational structures, no pattern of organization for teacher education applicable to all types of institutions is prescribed. Instead, three criteria for evaluating this factor are set forth as follows:

The organization (a) should assure consistent policies and practices with reference to the different segments of the teacher education program regardless of the administrative units under which they operate, (b) should facilitate the continuous development and improvement of the teacher education program, and (c) should clearly fix responsibility for the administration of policies agreed upon.

Implications of Standard for Program

The statement which follows should not be regarded as a part of the Standard. Instead, it is meant to show how the Standard might be applied to this aspect of a teacher education program.

An organization will be regarded as acceptable for the development of policies when a single agency is made responsible for coordinating (a) the planning of teacher education curricula, (b) the development of policies that govern the admission of students to teacher education curricula, (c) the development of a system of registration and enrollment which makes it easy to identify all students preparing to teach and which can be understood by students and faculty, and (d) the development of policies and standards for the satisfactory completion of all teacher education curricula. Such an agency will be the unit (college, school, division, department) of Education or an interdepartmental committee or council. If it is an interdepartmental committee, its membership will be representative of those divisions within the institution in proportion to their proper concerns for teacher education.

An organization that is effective in the continuous development and improvement of the total teacher education program will be typified by (a) a clear definition of objectives for the major aspects of the program, (b) a continuous evaluation of the effectiveness of curricula and procedures, and (c) a consistent policy of development and testing of new and promising procedures.

Responsibility for the total program will be regarded as clearly assigned when some one person is held responsible for the administration of the total program and when that person is in a position to speak authoritatively for the total program. This same person will normally be the one responsible for recommending students for teacher certification.

Patterns of organization that deviate from the characterization above will also be regarded as acceptable if they can be justified in terms of the principles set forth in the paragraphs on standards for evaluating this factor and in terms of the objectives of the institution.

III

Student Personnel Programs and Services for Teacher Education

The student personnel program and services with special reference to teacher education are evaluated in relation to the student personnel program of the institution as a whole. The Standard which relates to student personnel services for teacher education is, therefore, based on the assumption that the organization, the quality of staff, and such functions as housing, health, and student government have been evaluated by the appropriate regional accrediting association. Only such personnel services as relate specifically to the preparation of teachers and professional school service personnel are covered in this Standard.

STANDARD

The major student personnel responsibilities of an institution with reference to prospective teachers relate to (a) admission to and retention in teacher education curricula, (b) advising and registration, and (c) records and placement.

An institution should have a plan of selective admission to and retention in teacher education which offers reasonable assurance that only persons of professional promise are prepared and recommended for entry into the teaching profession. Criteria for such admission and retention should be in addition to the general policies and procedures for admitting students to the institution as a whole. Once the student is admitted to a teacher education curriculum, his registration should be such as to identify him as a person preparing to teach.

An institution should have a well-defined plan of counseling designed to give assurance that advice to students and prospective students is given by persons of competence; that is, by persons who know the nature and scope of the teaching profession, the problems of the schools, and the resources of the institution available for preparing for the various school positions.

An institution should maintain a unified system of records for all persons preparing to teach in order that faculty members and placement officers who have use for such records may have available to them all appropriate academic and personnel data.

Implications of Standard for Program

The standards of admission will include some measures of the academic scholarship of the student in high school and early years of college, the ability of the student in areas especially needed in teaching, such as verbal expression and health, and the aptitude of the student for the areas or levels of teaching for which he is seeking admission. Certainly the standards for admission to and completion of teacher education curricula will be greater than the minimum required for students not following professional curricula.

Advising will be regarded as most effective when it is shared by academic and professional education faculty members with well-formulated curricula to be used by them as a basis for guidance. If the registration of the student would not normally help to identify him as one preparing to teach, such identification will be established by joint registration in the department or division of education and the academic department or division where the student plans to take his degree. Under all circumstances there will be some time at which all students preparing to teach can be identified as prospective teachers.

Sufficient data on the professional assignments, activities, and performance of graduates will be secured to enable an institution to evaluate itself.

IV

Faculty for Professional Education

The statement of the Standard, and the guide for developing information on this Standard, is based on the assumption that the general conditions which make for a strong faculty, such as preparation, academic freedom, sabbatical leave, salary, and retirement, have been found by the appropriate regional association to be satisfactory. The statement here applies, therefore, to the special conditions that relate to those faculty members who have some direct responsibility for the strictly professional aspects of the teacher education program.

STANDARD

The preparation and experience backgrounds of the professional education faculty as a whole should be in keeping with the professional responsibilities to be carried. Each faculty member will be expected to be competent in the field or fields of his assignment. The qualifications of the faculty for extension and summer session assignments should meet the same high standards.

An institution should provide a faculty for professional education adequate in number to handle the scope of the professional education offered and to perform the necessary planning and counseling functions. The total functions of professional education faculty members are best performed by persons giving all or a substantial portion of their time to professional education; therefore, the use of faculty members teaching only part time in professional education should be limited to those who can keep abreast of developments in their fields as related to elementary and secondary schools.

The teaching load of each faculty member should be determined by the kinds and amount of services he is expected to render. The total professional education load should be so distributed as to allow for reasonable specialization in the assignment of each faculty member.

Implications of Standard for Program

The basic work in professional education will be offered primarily by full-time faculty members who have specific preparation for the fields which they are asked to cover. It will not be assumed that any one full-time person can cover the basic courses necessary in a teacher education program even if that program is limited to the preparation of teachers for one level. As curricula are widened in scope or advanced curricula are introduced, the depth of preparation of professional education faculty members will be increased and their assignments will become more specialized. Some professional education faculty member will be responsible for coordinating the work of all faculty members who teach professional education courses whether these persons are carrying their major assignments in the department or school of education or in some academic division. The vitality of the professional education faculty will be evidenced by strong leadership within the institution, the state, and the nation; by continuous efforts toward the improvement of teaching; by contact with appropriate school situations; by productivity in writing; and by study and research in the periodic review and improvement of the teacher education program.

The teaching load of each faculty member will be determined by (a) the number of different preparations per week, (b) the number of students for which he is responsible, (c) the nonteaching responsibilities which he has, (d) the amount of personal attention which each assignment requires, and (e) the experience of the faculty member. The total load will be balanced among the faculty members. Extension teaching, consultant services, research, membership on active committees, counseling, and supervision of student teaching will not be added to what is regarded by the institution as a normal load. The teaching load, taking into account the factors mentioned above, will be in harmony with the load assigned in the institution generally.

V

Curricula for Teacher Education

All curricula, both undergraduate and graduate, offered by the institution for the education of teachers are covered by this Standard. As here used, a curriculum is a configuration of courses and experiences specifically designed to prepare persons for a particular school position. The organization of content and the quality within the individual subject-matter courses should be the concern of the appropriate regional accrediting association. The pattern of these courses within curricula for the preparation of teachers shall be the concern of the Council. These patterns may vary among institutions.

STANDARD

Each curriculum should be specifically planned in terms of the common needs of all teachers and the special needs of persons who will fill the position for which the teacher education curriculum is designed. The planning should be with reference to both the subject matter and the professional education needed to prepare for a specific school position.

The following should be the guidelines in the development of teacher education curricula at both the undergraduate and graduate levels:

1. An institution should plan a sequence or pattern for each teacher education curriculum consisting of the basic subject-matter and professional education courses which all persons must take in order to complete that curriculum.
2. All teacher education curricula should require a pattern of general education in such amount and of such nature as to assure that all teachers will be broadly educated and cultured persons.
3. The nature and amount of subject-matter concentration required in each teacher education curriculum should be such as to assure adequate background for the position to be filled. There may be differences between the patterns of such programs for elementary and secondary teachers and among the various teaching fields at the secondary level.
4. The nature and amount of professional education required for each curriculum should be such as to assure competence for the position to be filled.
5. The total pattern for each teacher education curriculum should provide general education, subject specialization, and professional education in such amounts as to assure reasonable competence in each area and provide balance in the total pattern.

Implications of Standard for Program

In order for an institution to have a planned program in the sense described in the standards above, the basic elements of the pattern will need to be prescribed and the sequence definitely determined. A curriculum that merely provides the courses required for state certification is not regarded as a planned curriculum for teacher education. There will be a general education program and, if there are exceptions made for certain levels or fields, the institution will be in a position to justify them on the ground that they are adequate for the development of broadly educated and cultured individuals. The nature and amount of subject matter required in addition to general education will bear an obvious relationship to the grade level or subject field for which the student is preparing to teach. It will not be assumed that a regular departmental major designed for other purposes will necessarily meet the subject-matter needs of teachers. There will be a definite sequence of courses in professional education for each curriculum. The major elements will be the same for all prospective teachers and variations made for the different school positions. The courses in Education and in other fields will be so scheduled and planned that they can be taken in their proper sequence. Provisions will be made for laboratory time in the schedule and in program planning for those Education courses that require it. The institution will have a curriculum plan and pattern for each position, not two or more optional plans.

Each student will be expected at some point to commit himself to a curriculum and to follow it to completion. If a student enters a curriculum late, he will be expected to remove such deficiencies as exist in his preparation and his curriculum will then follow an orderly sequence. The same principles of a planned program will apply for experienced teachers, for former teachers preparing to return to service, and for college graduates with no specific professional preparation at the undergraduate level. Courses in Education and in other fields which require library or laboratory facilities that cannot be provided in off-campus situations will be offered on campus where such facilities are available. The amount of credit for off-campus study applicable to the completion of any curriculum will be sharply limited and will be granted only for such courses as are listed as acceptable for the curriculum concerned. Persons in full-time employment will be limited in the amount of on-campus and off-campus work which they may take during an academic year not counting the summer session.

VI

Professional Laboratory Experiences for School Personnel

Professional laboratory experiences including student teaching constitute an essential part of the professional education sequence for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. These experiences include, for the purpose of these Standards, all well-ordered relationships which students have with schools and communities which contribute to the understandings they need in performing their educational functions. The importance of such experiences and the necessity for being specific with reference to standards concerning them justify giving this aspect of teacher education a special heading in the Standards. The Standards set forth below are based on the assumption that learning to perform the functions of a teacher requires a combination of direct experience and systematic study.

STANDARD

Courses in the professional education sequence such as child growth and development, educational psychology, and methods should provide appropriate laboratory experiences for all students under the direction of the faculty member who teaches each course. Adequate facilities for this purpose, either on the campus or near enough to be used by students and faculty, should be provided. The arrangement for these facilities should be such as to assure their unhampered use for laboratory purposes. The number of teachers and pupils in the schools used for this purpose and for student teaching should be large enough to provide these experiences without jeopardizing the quality of educational experiences for children.

The professional laboratory experiences should culminate in a continuous period of student teaching so organized as to provide for a wide range of professional activities in which teachers should engage, and so administered as to assure that the activities contribute substantially to the learning of students. Facilities adequate to provide such experiences at a high level of effectiveness for the number of students involved should be provided. The working arrangement between the institution and the school(s) where student teaching is done should constitute a partnership which places appropriate responsibilities on school administrators, supervising teachers, and college supervisors for the supervision of student teachers.

The curriculum for each student should be so organized and the counseling so done as to make it possible for the student to participate fully in these laboratory experiences. The policies with reference to the amount and kind of laboratory experiences to be provided should be definite and should be characterized by consistency from field to field and level to level.

Adequate provisions for supervision by the college faculty should be made for all aspects of professional laboratory experiences, including those prior to student teaching as well as student teaching itself.

Implications of Standard for Program

The patterns of laboratory experiences used by institutions to meet this Standard may vary greatly. In fact, the tolerable variations in practices relating to this Standard may be greater than for any other Standard. However, the pattern followed by an institution will be evaluated in accordance with the principles set forth above. It should be understood that one- and two-hour assignments for a semester do not meet these standards.

The following description is an example of the kind of program that clearly meets the Standard. *It should not be interpreted as being the only program* of laboratory experiences *which meets the Standard,* however.

A faculty member has been designated as the director of professional laboratory experiences. His duties are to make provision for facilities and otherwise take care of the administrative arrangements necessary for faculty members to provide professional laboratory experiences prior to student teaching, do the same with reference to student teaching, and provide the leadership necessary to develop an effective partnership between the institution and the cooperating school(s). Through his efforts, the campus laboratory school provides laboratory experiences prior to student teaching for 200 of the 300 students involved, and two other school systems within ten miles of the institution provide for the others. He has negotiated satisfactory arrangements with seven school systems to provide for all student teaching. These arrangements clearly define the responsibilities of the institution and the schools and provide for periodic conferences at the institution involving administrators and cooperating teachers from all seven cooperating schools.

Courses in child growth and development, educational psychology, and methods are scheduled as laboratory courses with specific provisions for laboratory time for both students and faculty. The laboratory experience culminates in an extended period of full-time student teaching for every prospective teacher. This is done by each student in one of the seven cooperating schools under the direction of the principal and a supervising teacher. The student teacher works with the supervising teacher about half of each day and spends the other half selecting and organizing materials of instruction and learning the functions of a teacher outside the classroom. Most supervising teachers are responsible for one student per semester, never more than two. There are enough college faculty members assigned to the supervision of student teaching so that each is responsible for a maximum of twenty student teachers. This number is regarded as a full load for a faculty member, and with this group he receives some help from the supervising teacher, who holds at least a master's degree, and from the academic faculty.

VII

Facilities and Instructional Materials for Teacher Education

The strength of a teacher education program is determined in part by its supporting facilities, equipment, and materials of instruction. Some of these facilities are necessary to provide any effective program in higher education; others are required only when teacher education programs are offered. This Standard deals, therefore, with only what an institution should have by way of facilities, equipment, and materials to support an adequate program of professional education.

STANDARD

Office space, attractive in nature and ample in amount, should be provided to serve the needs of the professional education faculty in planning the professional education program, in counseling the students, and in working effectively with schools and other agencies outside the institution. Classroom space equipped for teaching professional education should be provided within a reasonably concentrated area to meet the needs of the program offered. Adequate facilities for producing and duplicating written materials should be available, and modern audiovisual equipment should be readily accessible.[1]

A materials laboratory or center should be maintained either as a part of the library or as a separate unit. In any case, it should be open to students as a laboratory of materials of instruction and should be directed by a faculty member well informed in the various instructional media and materials at different grade levels. This laboratory should include a wide array of books commonly used in elementary and secondary schools; various types of audiovisual aids such as maps, charts, pictures, filmstrips, and recordings; various types of materials used in evaluating learning; and curricular patterns, courses of study, and teaching units that are available.

The basic books and periodicals in professional education should be included in all libraries of institutions where teachers are prepared. Such additional books and periodicals as are needed to support the program offered should be provided. The number of titles of books and magazines should be determined by the scope of the program, and the number of copies largely by the number of students to be served. Adequate materials under the heading of audiovisual aids should be provided somewhere within the institution.

---

[1] Facilities necessary for professional laboratory experiences are indicated in Standard VI.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

What Is It?

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national voluntary association of colleges and universities organized to improve the quality of institutional programs of teacher education. All types of four-year institutions for higher education are represented in the present membership. These include private and church-related liberal arts colleges, state teachers colleges, state colleges, state universities, private and church-related universities, and municipal universities. The teacher education programs offered by member institutions are varied. Only one uniform theme dominates the AACTE—*the dedication to ever-improving quality in the education of teachers.*

How Is the Program Carried Out?

The AACTE carries out its program through the voluntary services of representatives from member institutions, a full-time professional staff at the Headquarters Office, and continuing as well as special committees. Special projects and activities are developed to implement Association objectives. The Annual Meeting, held in February, is planned to consider current issues in teacher education and Association business as well as the development of acquaintances within the membership. Biennially, the AACTE sponsors a week-long School for Executives which provides an opportunity for concentrated professional attention to specific problems concerned with institutional teacher education programs. An important program of publications supplements the AACTE meetings and committee work. By means of the *Bulletin,* the Association serves as a clearinghouse of information concerning the education of teachers. As a member of the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education (AOTE), the AACTE works in a coordinated effort to improve the education of teachers. Through the Advisory Council of the AOTE, the cooperating groups are represented on the Executive Committee of the AACTE. Consultations are arranged upon request to assist member institutions in meeting specific teacher education problems.

What Are the Values of Membership?

Through affiliation with the Association, an institution joins with other colleges and universities in planning and carrying out a program to improve teacher education on local, national, and international levels. By means of the services and resources of the AACTE, direct assistance can be given in the solution of problems facing all teacher education programs. The preparation of teachers for the schools of America is a problem which transcends local and state boundaries. Every institution committed to the education of teachers has much to gain by joining in this institutionally directed, national voluntary effort.

The Association is a constituent member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and as such provides valuable institutional backing for the Council's accrediting program. The AACTE provides important financial support for the NCATE. Member institutions which are accredited do not pay a separate yearly accrediting fee, inasmuch as this is covered by the Association's yearly contribution to the NCATE.

How Does a College Become a Member?

Colleges and universities which offer a four-year degree program accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association and which have the education of teachers as an important function may apply for membership. The AACTE is not an accrediting agency. Applications are acted upon once each year, at the time of the Annual Meeting in February. Official forms may be obtained by qualified institutions from the Association's Headquarters Office. A statement from the institution's catalogue or other official document, indicating that teacher education is recognized as one of the important purposes of the institution, should be submitted with the application. An additional statement should be provided by the chief administrative officer of the institution, indicating that the college or university proposes to take an active part in the work of the AACTE. After recommendation by the Executive Committee and approval by the Association, the institution may, upon payment of its membership fee for the current year, become a member of the AACTE. This membership shall continue contingent upon the payment of annual dues. Associate membership is available for eligible institutions working toward full membership in the Association; details are available from the Headquarters Office. The continued increase in Association membership reflects increased services and vitality. For further information, write:

Executive Secretary
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

D

A SUMMARY OF REVISIONS OF STANDARDS AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

April 1968 Revisions of the December 1967 Draft of Proposed New Standards

May 1968

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W. - Washington, D. C. 20036

INTRODUCTION

This brochure reports the substance of the major revisions made in Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: A Draft of the Proposed New Standards, with Study Guide (December 1967) by AACTE's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee. These revisions were formulated in April 1968 by the Committee after analyzing many reactions to the proposed new standards. The revisions which follow are correlated with and presuppose a reading of the December 1967 draft of the standards.

AACTE is engaged in a three-year study to develop new accreditation standards for teacher education which will more adequately meet the contemporary needs of teacher education in our society. This summary of the revisions of the December 1967 draft of the proposed new accreditation standards is another step in the developmental process.

A significant number of the changes reported in this summary are a direct result of the criticisms and/or suggestions submitted by interested educators. By March 15, 1968, the Committee had received approximately 700 response cards and 200 letters reacting to the proposed new standards. The Committee also had available for study 85 summaries of the group discussions held at the AACTE Annual Meeting in Chicago, February 1968. The cards, letters, and discussion summaries reflect strong support for the general direction of the proposed standards. They also include some criticisms and many helpful suggestions for improving the standards, preambles, and questions.

The Committee invites readers to react to the proposed new standards as revised in April 1968. These revised standards are being tested in eight pilot institutions during 1968-69. Further revision of the proposed standards is subject to the results of the tests which will be completed in May 1969, and to the reactions which will have been submitted to the Committee by that time.

Final recommendations for new accreditation standards for teacher education will be formulated by the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee in late 1969. These recommendations will be submitted to the AACTE Executive Committee for approval and transmission to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for action and implementation.

KARL MASSANARI
Associate Secretary, AACTE

The following three AACTE publications are products of the Evaluative Criteria Study and are available for purchase.

1. "A Summary of Revisions of Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: April 1968 Revisions of the December 1967 Draft of Proposed New Standards" (May 1968) - 15¢ per copy.
2. Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: A Draft of the Proposed New Standards, with Study Guide (December 1967) - 50¢ each for 1-25 copies, 25¢ each for 26 or more copies. Persons who have not previously received the December 1967 draft are strongly urged to secure both this publication and the "Summary of Revisions" (#1).
3. Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education: A Source Book on Selected Issues (1967), 130 pp. - $2.50 per copy.

Orders should be mailed to:

Department 8
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. - Washington, D.C. 20036

THE REVISIONS

1. The proposed new standards are now titled STANDARDS FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION. The term "evaluative criteria" has been deleted from the December 1967 draft. The questions following each standard, which were identified as "evaluative criteria" in the draft, are now considered simply questions designed to elicit evidence that will show the extent to which a standard is met. (See paragraph 1, page 11.) [1]/

2. Master's degree programs for teachers, with the exception of MAT programs for initial preparation, now are classified as advanced rather than as basic programs. (See section on applicability of standards, page 11; and the headings on pages 12 and 24.)

3. The "all or none" principle has been modified. Formal accreditation now will be extended for the following categories in the Part I Basic Programs: program for the preparation of elementary teachers, and program for the preparation of secondary teachers. Programs for the preparation of kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers will be considered as a separate category. Formal accreditation now will be extended for separate programs by school position in the Part II Advanced Programs. There is no change in the requirement that an institution must present for review all basic programs and/or all advanced programs. (See section on eligibility for national accreditation, page 11.)

4. Standard 1.1, page 12 - The word "natural" has been substituted for "basic physical" in the standard. The preamble and questions have been clarified but not changed substantively.

5. Standard 1.3, page 13 - The preamble has been amplified to include a rationale for including "content for the teaching specialty" as part of the professional studies component. Question 1.32 has been revised to read: "What cooperative arrangements exist for the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialties?" Question 1.33 now reads: "What evidence indicates that the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialties embody the judgment of appropriate members of the staff in the teaching specialties concerned and the appropriate members of the faculty of education?"

6. Standard 1.7, page 15 - The term used in the revision is "practicum" in place of "internship." Practicum in most situations will be student teaching; in some situations it may be internship. The preamble explains more fully the nature of a practicum experience. The phrase "from the institution and the cooperating school" has been added to the standard. Questions have been added regarding the nature of the cooperative arrangements between the institution and the cooperating schools and the quality of supervision provided for students.

7. Standard 1.8, page 16 - Question 1.84 has been added. It calls for evidence that the institution's program reflects an awareness of recent developments and pressing needs in teacher education (such as the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged and an international viewpoint in the program).

---

[1]/ This page reference and those which follow refer to the December 1967 draft of the proposed new standards: Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

8. Standard 1.9, page 16 - The standard has been expanded with the addition of the following sentence: "A majority of the membership of this body or unit is composed of staff members who are significantly involved in the education of teachers, and who have an understanding of and concern for school needs and problems." Several of the questions which follow the standard have been clarified.

9. Standard 2.1, pages 16 and 17 - The revised preamble defines "faculty for teacher education" as those faculty members responsible for the instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies, in educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and in practicum. The preamble has been augmented with the following sentence: "The standard does not preclude the offering of an adequate program in teacher education with a small faculty, but it does prohibit the over-extension of faculty and the use of faculty in areas in which they are not competent."

10. Standard 2.2, page 17 - Experience and teaching competence have been added to the preamble as factors to be considered in determining quality of faculty. The following question has been added as 2.23: "On what basis are faculty members promoted and/or placed on tenure?"

11. Standard 2.3, page 17 - Question 2.34 concerning a twelve-hour faculty load has been deleted.

12. Standard 3.2, page 19 - Question 3.24 now reads: "What justification does the institution offer if it admits students who score in the lower ranges of the distribution on nationally normed tests?"

13. Standard 3.3, page 19 - Question 3.34 now reads: "What justification is given for continuing students in the teacher education program who score in the lower ranges on nationally normed tests, or who are in the lower ranges of the distribution of grade point averages?"

14. Standard 4.1, page 20 - Question 4.14 has been revised to read: "What evidence shows that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations of professional organizations and learned societies for library holdings, personnel, and services?" Question 4.18 has been added: "What evidence confirms that the library is directed by qualified personnel?"

15. Standard 4.2, page 21 - The standard has been expanded with the addition of "and is adequate to support the teacher education program." Questions 4.22(a) and 4.23 have been expanded with the addition of "and in higher education."

16. Standard 4.3, page 21 - Question 4.34 has been revised to read: "What disposition has been made of requests from faculty members during the past two years for improvements in physical facilities?"

17. Standard G-1.8, page 26 - The standard has been expanded to include a requirement for "some period of full-time residence study for candidates pursuing advanced degrees other than the doctorate."

18. Standard G-2.5, page 28 - Question G-2.57 concerning a nine-hour faculty load has been deleted.

19. Added standard: G-3.5, page 30 - A new standard on student involvement in the graduate programs in education has been added. It is comparable to 3.6, page 20.

E

STANDARDS FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

A Second Draft of the Proposed New Standards

April 1968

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. - Washington, D.C. 20036

FOREWORD

The first draft of the proposed new accreditation standards for teacher education was released in December 1967. By March 15 the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee had received approximately 700 response cards, 200 letters, and 85 summaries of group discussions reacting to the proposals in the first draft. The preliminary draft was revised by the Committee after studying the many reactions which were submitted.

This draft, the second, includes the Introduction and the Part I: Basic Programs section in their entirety. Since fewer changes were made in the Part II: Advanced Programs section, only the revisions are included.

ALL REVISIONS ARE NOTED IN ITALIC PRINT.

The proposed new standards as revised in this draft will be tested in eight pilot institutions during 1968-69. Further revisions in these standards may be made, depending on the results of the tests.

KARL MASSANARI
Associate Secretary

STANDARDS FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Introductory Statement

National accreditation of institutional programs for preparing teachers for all grades and subjects and school service personnel at the elementary and secondary school levels is the exclusive responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE has been authorized by the National Commission on Accrediting to adopt standards and to continue the development of policies and procedures for accreditation. The NCATE is also responsible for implementing accreditation procedures and determining the accreditation status of teacher education programs.

The standards presented herein state conditions of acceptability for accreditation. They are the means through which the purposes of national accreditation can be achieved.

Purposes of National Accreditation of Teacher Education

National accreditation of teacher education serves three major purposes:

1. It helps to protect children and youth from ill-prepared school personnel.
2. It assures the public that particular institutions - those named in the Annual List - offer programs of teacher education which meet national standards.
3. It provides a practical basis for reciprocity among the states in certifying professional personnel.

While these are the main purposes for the accreditation of teacher education, it is assumed that an indirect outcome of the accreditation process will be the improvement of the teaching profession through the improvement of preparation programs.

Institutional Self-Governance and National Accreditation

Both public and private institutions of higher learning in the United States have a long heritage of self-governance. The right of colleges and universities to set their own goals and to shape their own destinies has accounted for a large measure of the excellence - and perhaps inadequacy as well - which is found among institutions of higher learning today. The freedom of institutions to move toward higher levels of excellence should be encouraged and supported by national accreditation. When accreditation distracts an institution from this mission or encroaches upon its freedom to accomplish it, the accreditation process has become inconsistent with its own purposes.

It is equally true, however, that national accreditation can exert a countervailing force when institutions aspire to expand programs beyond the capacity of available resources, and when they offer marginal or poor programs. National accreditation represents a common floor of acceptability. However, each institution of higher learning is free to seek or not seek national accreditation.

Institutional Experimentation and Innovation

The NCATE encourages responsible experimentation and innovation as a rational and systematic basis for long-range improvement of teacher education. If the autonomy of institutions of higher education in the United States is to be real, each college and university should have freedom to engage in experimentation and innovation. National accreditation should neither encroach upon an institution's self-governance nor encroach upon the institution's right to be inventive. In order to encourage experimentation and innovation, the standards permit a great deal of latitude in designing and conducting preparation programs. However, the institution must assume full responsibility for the quality of experimental programs.

National Standards

Accreditation by the National Council for accreditation of Teacher Education certifies that the institution's programs for preparing teachers and other professional school personnel meet its standards. This certification validates the quality of an instructional program, and signifies that persons recommended by the institution can be expected to perform satisfactorily in typical teaching and service positions throughout the United States. The standards which are applied to programs are "minimum standards" for acceptability. They are designed as guides for estimating the adequacy of institutional programs. Any type of regionally accredited institution can fulfill the standards if the institution has a clear understanding of the teaching function and a serious commitment to teacher education, and if it allocates its resources appropriately.

The standards set forth in this document are "minimum standards," and therefore the NCATE urges institutions to set higher standards for themselves, and through experimentation and research, to strive for better ways to prepare teachers and school service personnel.

Each standard is preceded by a preamble which gives its rationale, states the underlying assumptions, interprets its meaning, and defines unfamiliar terms. Following each standard are questions designed to elicit evidence that will show the extent to which the standard is met. It is expected that all of these questions will be answered in the institution's report. It is not assumed, however, that the questions included for each standard are exhaustive; an institution may provide other information to show how it is meeting a standard.

The Continuous Review of Standards

The revised (1965) Constitution of the NCATE (Article VII, Section B) states:

> Responsibility for carrying on a systematic program of evaluation of standards and development of new and revised standards shall be allocated to the AACTE. The AACTE shall insure the participation of representatives of institutions, organizations and fields of study concerned with teacher education, and the Council. The AACTE shall receive and consider recommendations about existing or revised standards from institutions which prepare teachers and from individuals and organizations concerned with teacher education.

This provision explicitly calls for the continuous review and development of standards. It also calls for the systematic involvement of professional groups, learned societies, individuals, institutional representatives, and members of the Council in this process. Thus, the revised constitution provides for continuous review, development, and testing of standards with maximum involvement of those persons and organizations most directly concerned with their application and impact.

If accreditation standards are to reflect changing conditions in higher education generally and in teacher education particularly, they will not remain static or be pegged to any level of excellence. It is expected that from time to time the floor of acceptability will be raised. This means that as standards evolve and are improved, institutions can expect to meet new and different standards on reaccreditation. If subsequent to their reaccreditation they choose to expand or to establish new programs of specialized study, the adequacy of these changes must be examined. The reaccreditation of institutional programs therefore can be as challenging as initial accreditation.

Applicability of the Standards

Separate sets of standards are to be applied to basic and to advanced programs of teacher education. Basic refers to all programs for the initial preparation of teachers whether they are four- or five-year programs. Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) programs are considered as basic programs. Advanced refers to all programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the advanced (in addition to the basic) preparation of teachers and specialized school personnel.

The standards in Part I are to be applied to all basic programs: programs for the initial preparation of teachers (kindergarten through the twelfth grade) through the fifth-year, including M.A.T. programs. They are not applicable to programs for the preparation of teacher aides or other paraprofessionals.

The standards in Part II are to be applied to all advanced programs: programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the advanced preparation of teachers and specialized school personnel. They are not applicable to programs for the preparation of college teachers or non-school personnel.

Eligibility for National Accreditation

Institutions which meet the following two conditions qualify for evaluation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education:

1. Institutions offering basic degree programs for preparing teachers and/or school service personnel.
2. Institutions accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association and state departments of education at the levels and in the categories for which NCATE accreditation is sought.

The Council regards accreditation by a regional accrediting association as reasonable assurance as to the overall quality of an institution, including its general financial stability, the effectiveness of its administration, the adequacy of its general facilities, the quality of its student personnel program, the appropriateness of its overall program of study, the strength of its faculty, the adequacy of its faculty personnel policies, and the quality of instruction.

An institution accepted for evaluation shall present for review:

1. All basic programs: programs offered for the initial preparation of elementary, secondary, and kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers (programs resulting in the recommendation for professional certification) whether they are four-year, five-year, or M.A.T. programs: and/or
2 All advanced programs: programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the advanced preparation of teachers and specialized school personnel.

Formal accreditation will be extended for the following categories in the Part I Basic Programs: program for the preparation of elementary teachers[1]; program for the preparation of secondary teachers[1]. Formal accreditation will be extended for separate programs by school position in the Part II Advanced Programs.

---

[1] All programs for the preparation of kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers offered by the institution will be considered as a separate category.

PART I: BASIC PROGRAMS

Programs for the *Initial* Preparation of Teachers Through the
Fifth-Year *Level, Including M.A.T. Programs*

1. THE PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

1.1 The General Studies Component

Teachers ought to have as much general education as it is possible for them to have - not only because they require it as cultivated human beings, but also because subjects studied in general education may support their teaching field. Moreover, only a well-informed, cultivated person presents an adequate model for children and youth in the school environment.

Institutional programs of general or liberal education vary widely, although certain elements are usually to be found in all of them. This precludes prescribing general education in terms of subjects and credit hours *in the standard.* The view reflected in the standard is that general education should include the studies most widely generalizable to life and further learning. The areas of studies designated below satisfy this requirement and encompass the contents of most of the standard patterns of general education. Far more important than the specific content of general education is that it be taught with generalizability rather than with academic specialization as a primary objective.

It should be noted that no optimum *or maximum* amount of time for general education has been designated. In addition, the general education requirement is not regarded as meeting, in full, the prospective teacher's need for the study of academic subject matter (see standard *1.3*).

As used in the standard, "symbolics of information" is that part of general education which deals with communication through symbols, including studies in such areas as linguistics, languages, communication skills, mathematics, logic, and information theory.

The figures suggested in the standard refer to a four-year program.

THE STANDARD

1.1 The general studies component of the program for prospective teachers requires that from one-third to one-half time be devoted to studies in the symbolics of information, *natural* and behavioral sciences, and humanities.

- 1.11 *What* courses, seminars, and readings are offered in each area of general studies identified in the standard?
- 1.12 What are the arrangements for insuring that a distribution, or series, of courses, seminars, and readings are taken in each area of general studies?
- 1.13 What *evidence shows* that the programs of all prospective teachers meet the institution's standard requirements in general studies?

1.14 What evidence (such as state and regional accreditation reports, student achievement data, and/or scholarship awards) *reflects* the quality of the general studies component of the teacher education program?

1.15 What ratio between the general studies component and the professional studies component is the institution seeking to maintain?

1.16 What evidence is there that some *initial* assessment is made of the level and quality of each student's general education background and that appropriate individualization of his program is made?

1.17 What evidence *shows* that the selection of content for the general studies component of the teacher education program embodies the judgment of both the academic staff and the teacher education faculty?

1.18 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in the general studies component of the teacher education program?

1.2 The Professional Studies Component

The professional part of the curriculum designed to prepare teachers is to be distinguished from the general studies component: the latter includes whatever instruction is deemed desirable for all educated human beings, regardless of their prospective vocation; the former - professional component - covers all requirements that are justified by the work of the specific vocation of teaching. In the standards that follow (1.2 to 1.7) it is assumed, therefore, that whether a study is to be *classified as* general or professional does not depend on the name of the study or the department in which the instruction is offered; it depends rather on the function the study is to perform, viz., whether it is to be part of general education or of specialized vocational preparation.

The ingredients (not courses necessarily) of the professional studies component may be classified as follows:

- The professional studies component.....................Standard 1.2
  - Content for the *teaching specialty*................Standard 1.3
    - Content to be taught to pupils
    - Supplementary knowledge from the subject field(s) to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching
  - *Theory and Practice*
    - Humanistic and behavioral studies............Standard 1.4
    - Educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience...............Standards 1.5 and 1.6
    - *Practicum*..................................Standard 1.7

The nature and function of these ingredients will be specified in separate sections *(standards 1.3 through 1.7)*.

THE STANDARD

1.2 The professional studies component of the curriculum includes the following ingredients combined in a rationally designed pattern of instruction. (a) content for the *teaching specialty* - content to be taught to pupils, and supplementary knowledge from the subject matter field(s) to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching, and (b) *theory and practice* - humanistic and behavioral studies, educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience and *practicum.*

1.21 In the curriculum and in the teaching-learning experiences afforded the student - can the different elements in the professional studies component be clearly identified? How are they specified?

1.22 What evidence indicates that the professional studies component has been systematically constructed? *What* is the organizing principle of the design?

1.23 On what principle is the ratio among different elements in the professional studies component determined?

1.3 The Professional Studies Component: Content for the *Teaching Specialty*

The inclusion of "Content for the Teaching Specialty" in the professional studies component is to recognize the central importance of appropriate subject matter in a teaching specialty as a vital element in the professional preparation of the teacher. It does not imply that instruction in such subject matter should be carried on in any specific school or department or in any specific format, such as "courses." The instruction in the subject matter for the teaching specialties is the basic responsibility of the respective academic departments, the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for a teaching specialty, however, is the joint responsibility of appropriate members of the staff in the teaching specialty concerned and the appropriate members of the faculty of education.

The standard draws attention to the fact that teaching requires two types of knowledge *which may be* over and beyond that which is required in general education. One is the knowledge that is to be taught to the pupil, e.g., the mathematics one plans to teach, the art one is expected to teach, the literature for children one plans to teach, or the science that one is to teach in the science class. The other type of knowledge will not be taught directly to the pupil, but may be needed by the teacher as a background for the teaching of a particular subject *at either the elementary or secondary level,e.g., history or* Anglo-Saxon for the teacher of English, American history *or literary criticism* for the teacher of American literature, political science *or anthropology* for the history teacher, mathematical logic for the teacher of mathematics, or abnormal psychology for the teacher of sex education. It is assumed in this standard that both kinds of knowledge are a required

THE STANDARD

1.3 The professional studies component of the curriculum includes the specialized study of (a) the content to be taught to pupils, and (b) the supplementary knowledge in the subject matter of the teaching *specialty* and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching.

1.31 What evidence is there that the requirements for *the teaching specialties* have been developed specifically to meet the need for:

a. content to be taught to pupils?
b. supplementary knowledge from the subject matter of the teaching *specialty* to be taught and from allied fields that are needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching?

1.32 What cooperative arrangements exist for the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialties?

1.33 What evidence indicates that the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialties embody the judgment of appropriate members of the staff in the teaching specialty concerned and the appropriate members of the faculty of education?

1.34 What information indicates that a systematic effort is being made to keep the content of the respective teaching *specialties* current with developments in the appropriate disciplines?

1.35 What evidence confirms that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations for the preparation of teachers made by national professional organizations *and learned societies?* 1/

1.36 What evidence shows that the programs of all prospective teachers include the appropriate content for their respective *teaching specialties?*

1.37 What *is done* to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in this part of the professional studies component?

1/ A number of professional associations and learned societies have as one of their major interests the improvement of teacher education. Some of these organizations have developed guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other school service personnel in their respective specialization fields. It is assumed that each institution will develop the rationale for its various programs in teacher education with due consideration for the recommendations in these guidelines.

During 1968-69 a number of pilot institutions will be engaged in testing the proposed standards. AACTE will provide a list of the most useful guidelines for these institutions as they study their programs in preparation for an NCATE evaluation.

Eventually, AACTE may assume the responsibility of publishing such a list

1.4 The Professional Studies Component: Humanistic and Behavioral Studies

Many disciplines *are important in the preparation of teachers.* However, not all disciplines are equally relevant, and their relevance is not always obvious. In the following standard it is assumed that problems concerning nature and aims of education, the curriculum, organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching-learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the philosophical issues to which they are related. These studies are referred to hereafter as the humanistic studies. The problems of education can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, and psychology. Such studies will be referred to as behavioral studies. These behavioral and humanistic studies differ from the usual study of sociology, economics, philosophy, and history in that they *have as their central concern* problems in education. Some of the behavioral studies may provide empirical generalizations that can be applied to educational practice; when they do, they become part of the educational theory and its applications that one studies in relation to one's field of specialization. However, humanistic and behavioral studies have as their primary purpose to provide the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood or interpreted.

The humanistic and behavioral studies in the professional component of the curriculum require as a prerequisite a familiarity with the parent disciplines on which they are based. *This familiarity may be acquired as part of the general studies and/or as part of the content for the teaching specialty.* The stating of the desirability of these prerequisites does not presuppose or prescribe any specific set or sequence of courses for meeting them.

THE STANDARD

1.4 The professional studies component includes instruction in the humanistic studies, e.g., the history and philosophy of education; and the behavioral studies, e.g., sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, and psychology of education.

1.41 *In what way are* the humanistic and behavioral studies identified in the professional component of the program?

1.42 What evidence exists that the humanistic and behavioral studies identified in 1.41 are oriented toward the problems of educational policy and aims, curriculum, organization and administration, teaching and learning?

1.43 What evidence is there that the recommendations of professional organizations and learned societies for the preparation of teachers have been considered *seriously* in establishing the requirements for the humanistic and behavioral studies?[2]

1.44 What data show that the programs of all prospective teachers include the humanistic and behavioral studies prescribed by the institution?

1.45 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in this part of the professional studies component?

1.5 & 1.6 The Professional Studies Component: Educational Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience

As distinguished from the humanistic and behavioral studies and content for the *teaching specialty*, there is a body of knowledge about teaching and learning that can be the basis for *effective performance*. If teaching is to be more than a craft, teachers need to understand the theoretical principles which justify *what they do. For this reason*, the study of teaching-learning theory is included as part of the professional studies component in the preparation of teachers. However, like the study of other empirical theory, the study of the theories of teaching-learning requires laboratory exercises to make abstract principles more concrete and more intelligible. Much of what has been called both "general" and "special methods" can therefore be taught as the application of educational theory.

Whereas the study of teaching-learning theory provides the prospective teacher with principles of practice, and the laboratory exercises illuminate and demonstrate these principles, clinical experience in *teacher education* confronts the student with individual cases or problems - the diagnosis and solution of which involve principles and theory - but also familiarizes him with the class of cases to which they belong. Certain kinds of problems in discipline, motivation, testing, lesson planning, and presentation represent recurring types of classroom situations. Clinical teaching involves the student in the diagnosis and "treatment" of the individual case, but under the guidance of an experienced teacher. Because it is now possible to simulate many of these situations, or to display a selection of real cases electronically - and because the prospective teacher's efforts can be recorded, viewed, and reviewed - it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the classroom at a lower cost of time and personnel.

THE STANDARD

1.5 The professional studies component includes the study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory experience.

1.51 What specific provisions have been made for the study of theory relevant to teaching (such as curriculum, evaluation, motivation, classroom management, grouping, and/or individualization of instruction)?

1.52 What practices and procedures show that the study of teaching theory requires and emphasizes laboratory experiences (observations, demonstrations, problem-solving projects, *tutoring, micro-teaching*, and/or other direct experiential activities)?

1.53 What evidence exists that *serious* consideration has been given to the recommendations outlined by *professional* organizations *and learned societies* for the preparation of teachers?[3]

1.54 What data confirm that the programs of all prospective teachers include this aspect of the professional studies component?

1.55 What *is done* to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction in this aspect of the professional studies component?

---

[3] See footnote, page 9

THE STANDARD

1.6 The professional studies component includes the study of teaching and learning theory with clinical experience in generic teaching situations.

1.61 What are the provisions for including clinical experience in the professional studies component?
1.62 What data demonstrate that all prospective teachers systematically study typical teaching situations, actual or simulated, under the supervision of an experienced staff member?
1.63 What evidence indicates that consideration has been given to the recommendations on this aspect of teacher education made by national professional organizations *and learned societies?*[4/]
1.64 What *is done* to evaluate the effectiveness of this aspect of the professional studies component?

1.7 The Professional Studies Component: *Practicum*

Practicum is the capstone of the preparation program of the prospective teacher. It is a period during which the student tests and reconstructs the theory which he has been taught, and during which he develops his teaching style. Practicum provides the opportunity for the student to assume substantial responsibility for the full range of teaching duties in a real school situation under the supervision of qualified personnel from the institution and from the cooperating elementary or secondary school. It presupposes the learning experiences of all the other professional studies; it is not a substitute for them. It is a more concrete and complete learning activity than observation, laboratory or clinical experience.

Practicum in most situations will be student teaching; in some situations it may be internship.

THE STANDARD

1.7 The professional studies component includes direct substantial participation in teaching over an extended period of time under the supervision of qualified personnel from the institution and the cooperating school.

1.71 What evidence is there that every prospective teacher has an opportunity to assume substantial responsibility for the full range of teaching duties over an extended period of time?
1.72 What systematic method of recording or describing the teaching performance of the student is used which enables students and supervisors to analyze the extent to which teaching behavior is consistent with the theory that has been taught?

[4/] See footnote, page 9

1.73 *What evidence is there that the supervising teachers in the cooperating schools are superior teachers, are trained in supervision, and are committed to the task of educating teachers?*

1.74 *What evidence shows that cooperative arrangements exist between the institution and the cooperating schools for the operation of practicums? What evidence is there that these arrangements promote the effective operation of practicums?*

1.75 *What evidence shows that the relationship between professional personnel in the institution and in the cooperating schools contributes positively to the effective operation of practicums?*

1.76 *What evidence confirms that the supervision of students in the practicums is carried on by qualified personnel from the institution?*

1.77 *How is the supervision of students in practicums translated into an index of faculty load? For how many students in practicums does each teacher education faculty member have responsibility?*

1.78 *What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of the supervision provided for students in practicums?*

1.79 *What evidence indicates that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations made by professional organizations and learned societies for this part of the professional studies component?* [5]

1.8 Role of Research in the Program

Research was not included as a separate element in the professional studies component for several reasons. First, there seems to be some doubt as to how much research a student in a basic program could do or ought to be asked to do. Second, many of the recommendations for the various components of the program assume that the results of research will figure prominently in the experience of the student, e.g., instruction in various aspects of educational theory. Nonetheless, there should be provisions for making sure that the prospective teacher will be made aware of the basic nature of educational research and will learn how to read and interpret the results of such research within the field of specialization.

In addition, the institution periodically will engage in research on its own program to ascertain whether its present practices are the most effective means for accomplishing its purposes.

THE STANDARD

1.8 The program reflects an awareness of research and development in teacher education.

---

[5] See Footnote, page 9

1.81 In what ways do the prescribed studies, procedures, and overall design of the teacher education program give evidence of embodying research findings?

1.82 What means are used to test the student's ability to *locate*, interpret, and use research literature?

1.83 What activities indicate that the institution has or is engaged in research on its own program? What evidence shows that the research is more than "trying out something new"?

1.84 What evidence shows that the institution's program reflects an awareness of recent developments and pressing needs in teacher education (such as the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged and an international viewpoint in the program)?

1.9 Control of the Program

Administrative structure exists primarily as a practical arrangement for fixing responsibility, utilizing resources, and achieving goals; this is also true of administrative units responsible for the preparation of teachers. It is expected that the particular unit within the institution, officially designated as responsible for teacher education, has appropriate experience, preparation, and commitment to teacher education to accept and discharge this responsibility. Such a unit or body as referred to in the standard below means a council, commission, committee, department, school, college, or other recognizable organizational entity.

THE STANDARD

1.9 The primary responsibility for the design, approval, and continuous evaluation of the instructional program of teacher education lies with an officially designated body or unit within the institution. A majority of the membership of this body or unit is composed of staff members who are significantly involved in the education of teachers, and who have an understanding of and concern for school needs and problems.

1.91 *What evidence shows that* the majority of the membership of the official body *is* made up of staff members significantly involved in the education of teachers?

1.92 What evidence exists that the members of the official body have an understanding of and concern for school needs and problems?

1.93 What activities of the official body during the past two years demonstrate that it has assumed responsibility for the design, approval, and continuous evaluation of the instructional program of teacher education?

1.94 What evidence *shows* that all teacher education programs *offered by the institution are* approved *by the officially designated body?*

FACULTY FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

2.1 *Size and Preparation of Faculty for Teacher Education*

The size and preparation of the faculty in relation to the programs offered are crucial factors in teacher education, not only for the instructional program as such, but also for the total atmosphere in which the program is carried out. Above all, the quality of the program and the degree to which it is maintained depends largely on the faculty. In the standards that follow emphasis is placed on the experience, formal preparation, scholarly activity, teaching competence, and specialized competence of staff.

The standard (2.1) assumes that advanced graduate work in a well defined field of specialization is the minimal requirement that can safely be made for work in a collegiate institution. The standard does not preclude the offering of an adequate program in teacher education with a small faculty, but it does prohibit the over-extension of faculty and the use of faculty in areas in which they are not competent.

The distribution of faculty specialization called for by the standard is related to the several elements within the professional studies component of the program as outlined in standards 1.2 through 1.7. 'Faculty for teacher education' as used in standards 2.1 through 2.5 includes those faculty members responsible for the instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies, in educational theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and in practicum.

THE STANDARD

2.1 *Every institution has a full-time faculty in teacher education prepared at the graduate level (beyond the master's degree) with appropriate specializations. Such specializations should make possible competent instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies, in teaching-learning theory, and in the teaching of each of the specialities for which the institution prepares teachers. There should likewise be appropriate specializations to ensure competent supervision of all laboratory, clinical, and practicum experiences.*

2.11 What data indicate that there is a faculty for teacher education with qualifications sufficient to cover the instruction in the specified areas of the professional studies component?

2.12 What evidence is there that all courses and other learning experiences in the specified areas of the professional studies component are actually conducted by teachers appropriately prepared to do so?

2.2 *Quality* of Faculty

Quality of faculty may be established on the basis of *teaching competence, experience,* academic preparation, and scholarly performance. Scholarly competence is judged by publication, research, and/or recognition by the professional organization of the faculty member's field of specialization.

An institution will capitalize on the academic and professional strength of faculty by assignments which permit maximum use of preparation and experience. An institution may also relate its criteria for faculty selection and assignment to faculty performance and satisfaction.

THE STANDARD

2.2 Each teacher education faculty member teaches only in the field in which he has had graduate study at a regionally accredited or recognized foreign institution, or in which he has demonstrated a scholarly competence.

2.21 What data are available to show the relationship, over the last two years, of the teaching assignments of each faculty member in teacher education to his field of advanced preparation and his scholarly competence?

2.22 If any faculty members have been teaching outside their fields of scholarly competence, for how long and for what special reasons has this been permitted?

2.23 *On what basis are faculty members promoted and/or placed on tenure?*

2.3 Faculty Load

Because the faculty is a major determinant in the quality of a teacher education program, the institution has a plan for the efficient use of faculty competence, time, and energy. There are maximum limits for teaching loads. Adjustments are made in teaching loads when nonteaching duties are assigned. Time is allotted to permit the faculty member to do the planning involved in carrying out his assigned responsibilities. Time is made available so that he can continue his scholarly development.

THE STANDARD

2.3 The load (all services rendered) of each teacher education faculty member is such that he can study, plan, and otherwise prepare for his assigned responsibilities, and continue his scholarly development.

2.31 *What is the* plan for equating all professional duties and activities of the staff into an index of faculty load?

2.32 What is the assigned professional load (all services rendered) of each faculty member?
2.33 To what extent and for what reasons do the loads of any faculty members exceed the established institutional policy for faculty load?
2.34 What evidence is there that the teaching load is reduced to the extent that other nonteaching responsibilities are assigned?
2.35 To what extent have faculty members, during the last two years, engaged in professional and scholarly activities beyond their assigned duties?
2.36 What program does the institution have for long-range faculty development (such as sabbatical leaves, travel support, summer leaves, and/or fellowships), and to what extent is it operative?

2.4 Part-Time Faculty

Two kinds of situations seem to justify the employment of faculty on a part-time basis. One is the need of the institution for a special competence not represented on the full-time staff. The other is the need for additional service in areas of competence already represented on the full-time staff. For this reason the standard does not stipulate that part-time appointments be made only as a last resort. However, the hazards possible in part-time appointments should be guarded against. For example, a part-time assignment may be added to an already full work load carried on by the appointee outside of the institution; the involvement of the part-time staff in the life and governance of the institution may be minimal; the involvement with students may also be limited.

THE STANDARD

2.4 Part-time faculty meet minimum requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty and are employed when they can make a special contribution to the teacher education program.

2.41 What proportion of the teacher education program has been assigned to part-time faculty?
2.42 What are the qualifications of the part-time faculty members in teacher education?
2.43 What are the loads, within and outside the institution, for all part-time faculty members in teacher education?
2.44 What reasons support the utilization of each part-time faculty member in teacher education?
2.45 What evidence shows that part-time faculty are used in those segments of the teacher education program that need them especially?
2.46 How are part-time faculty members oriented to the basic purposes of the teacher education program?

2.5 Faculty Involvement with Schools

Faculty members who are instructing prospective teachers need to have continuing involvement with school environments so that their teaching and research will be current and relevant to the problems of the schools.

Furthermore, the commitment of a teacher education faculty is to the needs of the profession as well as to institutional programs. Elementary- and secondary-school personnel assume that they share with faculty members in colleges and universities a common purpose and interest, and view with respect the specialized talent of the college staff. An institution committed to teacher education in its entirety will therefore, within its resources, provide in-service assistance to the schools in the area which it serves.

THE STANDARD

2.5 Members of the teacher education faculty should have continuing involvement with elementary and secondary schools.

2.51 In what ways have members of the faculty for teacher education been associated with, and involved in, activities of elementary and secondary schools?
2.52 What evidence shows that such association and involvement is reflected in the institution's program?
2.53 What evidence is there to indicate that the special strengths of the teacher education faculty are reflected in the services offered to the schools?

---

3. STUDENTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

3.1 Admission to Teacher Education Programs

Students seeking admission to a program of teacher education may have to meet requirements in addition to those needed to enroll in the institution, because there are skills, understandings, and personal characteristics which are unique to teaching. It is assumed in the standard that not every college student can or should become a teacher.

THE STANDARD

3.1 Students admitted to a program of teacher education meet specific requirements for participation in the program.

3.11 What are the requirements for admission to the teacher education program in addition to those required for admission to the institution?

3.12 What rationale supports these requirements?
3.13 *What* evidence shows that the admission requirements are being applied?
3.14 How many students applied for admission to teacher education during each of the last two years? *How many students were admitted?* How many students were denied admission?
3.15 How many students who were rejected during the past two years have subsequently been admitted, and for what reasons?

3.2 Use of National Norms

It is recognized that no single criterion for the admission of students can predict success or failure infallibly, and this applies to scores on objective tests as well as to more subjective criteria. Nevertheless, scores on standardized tests are useful in predicting the probability of success in the program of studies prescribed for teacher education, and there is reason to believe that institutions ought not to rely solely on subjective criteria. The standard that follows assumes that institutions will use a number of criteria for admission and therefore mentions only standardized test scores.

THE STANDARD

3.2 Defined or established national norms of tests are used in determining eligibility for admission to teacher education.

3.21 What data, tests, and norms are being used as a basis of selection for admission to the teacher education program?
3.22 What formula is used to weigh the various criteria for admission?
3.23 What is the rationale for the formula used?
3.24 What justification does the institution offer if it admits students who score *in the lower ranges of the distribution* on nationally normed tests?

3.3 Screening on the Basis of Academic Achievement

The nature of the professional studies component of the teacher education program calls for a high order of academic achievement and growth in technical competence. Grades in course work provide the usual measures of achievement in theoretical work; reports and other modes of evaluation furnish measures of more direct experiences with the various phases of the program. The institution owes it to the student to determine as objectively and systematically as possible specific strengths and weaknesses as they affect his continuing in the program.

THE STANDARD

3.3 The institution takes into account at regular intervals the achievement of the prospective teacher in each area of the professional studies component as a basis for his continuing in the program.

3.31 What objective means are used to evaluate achievement in each area of the professional studies component of the program?
3.32 What data other than course grades are used to measure achievement?
3.33 What grade point average in each area of the professional studies component is required for students to continue in the program?
3.34 What justification is given for continuing students in the teacher education program who score *in the lower ranges of the distribution* on nationally normed tests, or who are *in the lower ranges of the distribution of* grade point averages?

3.4 Screening on the Basis of *Personal* Characteristics

While the academic competence of the teacher is a major determinant in effective teaching, it is not the only determinant. Prospective teachers should demonstrate personal characteristics which will contribute to rather than detract from their performance in the classroom. It is assumed in the standard that the institution has the right and the obligation to consider factors other than academic achievement as a basis for permitting a student to continue in a teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

3.4 The institution engages in a process of continuous selection whereby only those candidates who demonstrate personal characteristics appropriate to the requirements of teaching will be permitted to continue in the program.

3.41 On the basis of what *personal* characteristics does the institution screen students out of the program?
3.42 *For what reasons have* students been removed from the teacher education program during the past two years?
3.43 What evidence exists that students are aware of the various reasons for which they may be dropped from the program?

3.5 Student Personnel Services

Students planning to be teachers need qualified counselors and advisors to help them assess their strengths and weaknesses and to assist them in planning their program of studies and activities in light of such assessment. They need to be informed about professional organizations and agencies as well as current school problems. They also need to know about the wide variety of options available to them in teaching. It is therefore the obligation of an institution to have a systematic means for providing such aid and information to prospective teachers.

THE STANDARD

3.5 The institution has a well-defined plan of counseling and advising prospective teachers.

3.51 What evidence indicates that counseling services are readily available to every prospective teacher?
3.52 What information shows that counselors and advisors are competent persons - that is, persons who know the nature and scope of the teaching profession, the problems of the schools, and the institutional resources available to students?
3.53 How many prospective teachers have been referred by counselors or advisors to other specialized personnel within the institution during the past two years, and for what reasons?
3.54 For how many advisees is each advisor responsible?
3.55 To what extent does the institution maintain a comprehensive system of records for all prospective teachers which is readily and easily available to faculty members and placement officers for professional purposes?

3.6 Student Involvement in the Teacher Education Program

As constituents of the college community, prospective teachers should feel free, individually and collectively, to express their views on the teacher education program. They should, through their own organizations, through joint student-faculty groups, or as representatives to faculty committees, have clear channels and frequent opportunities to communicate their views on the adequacy and development of the teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

3.6 The institution makes provision for the expression of views of prospective teachers on the teacher education program.

3.61 What evidence shows that students are consulted by the faculty and administration on matters relating to the teacher education program?

3.62 What evidence is there that the college protects the right of the student to take reasoned exception to the views presented in any course in the teacher education program?

3.63 What are the major concerns which students in teacher education have expressed about the program during the past two years?

---

4. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

4.1 The Library

The quality of both the general and professional components of the program for teacher education is reflected in the scope and depth of the library holdings. As a principal instructional resource, the library holdings in *teacher* education must be adequate for the number of students to be served and pertinent to the kind and level of programs offered. The accession rate must be sufficient to assure that the quality of the collection is maintained. In addition to providing a collection of materials, library service must assure both students and faculty access to the materials.

THE STANDARD

4.1 The library, as the principal materials resource center of the institution, is adequate for the instructional, research, and other services pertinent to its teacher education program.

4.11 *To what extent* are standard and contemporary holdings in education - books, microfilms, microfiche copies - included in the *collection?*

4.12 *To what extent* are standard periodicals in education available to prospective teachers?

4.13 *To what extent* are such additional books and periodicals as needed to support the total teacher education program provided?

4.14 What evidence shows that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations of professional organizations and learned societies for library holdings, personnel, and services? [6]

4.15 What evidence demonstrates that the recommendations of *faculty members* for the acquisition of books, periodicals, and other materials have been met?

4.16 What is the annual record of library expenditures for the total library and for *teacher* education during the past five years?

4.17 *To what extent* do both students and faculty have access to and use the library holdings?

[6] See footnote, page 9

4.18 *What evidence confirms that the library is directed by qualified personnel?*

4.2 The Materials and Instructional Media Center

Equipment and resource materials in support of teaching have been developed extensively and improved markedly. A program for preparing teachers should make use of such equipment and materials in two important ways: prospective teachers should know how to make use of modern technologies in teaching, and modern technologies should be utilized in the teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

4.2 A materials and instructional media center for teacher education is maintained either as a part of the library or as one or more separate units *and is adequate to support the teacher education program.*

4.21 *What evidence shows that serious consideration has been given to the recommendations of professional organizations and learned societies for instructional media center holdings, personnel, and services?* 7/

4.22 Does the center contain equipment and materials which:

a. can be utilized at different grade levels and *in higher education?*

b. are representative of all areas in the curriculum?

c. reflect recent developments in the teaching of the various subject fields?

d. illustrate the wide array of available instructional media (such as films, filmstrips, realia, audio-video tapes, transparencies, teaching machines, and closed-circuit TV)'

4.23 *What evidence shows that* the center *is* directed by personnel who are well informed *about* the various instructional media and materials *for* different grade levels *and for higher education?*

4.24 *To what extent is* the center available to and used by students and faculty?

4.25 What evidence shows that the available instructional media are being used in the teacher education program itself?

4.26 What evidence shows that the recommendations from *faculty members* for the acquisition of materials for the center have been met?

7/ See footnote, page 9

4.3 Physical Facilities

Although physical facilities are not the main determinants of the quality of a program of an institution, each component of the program does entail the use of buildings and equipment, and some of the professional components make special demands on space and equipment. Moreover, the requirements of students and faculty for appropriate study, research, and living space cannot be reduced to the point where these activities lose their effectiveness. Because of the great variation in institutions the standard does not attempt to quantify its recommendation on physical facilities. It does not, however, counsel that each institution's facilities be adequate to its own program, because the program may not be adequate. The standard assumes that given an acceptable program, the adequacy of the physical facilities can be judged in terms of the operational requirements of that program.

THE STANDARD

4.3 The institution provides the physical facilities essential to the instructional and professional activities of the teacher education program.

4.31 What facts indicate that faculty have office space and other spaces which are necessary to carry out their responsibilities?
4.32 To what extent are the available spaces and equipment adequate to accomodate each student in the teacher education program?
4.33 In what ways does the availability and allotment of space and equipment facilitate or hinder the carrying out of faculty and administrative responsibility?
4.34 What disposition has been made of the requests from faculty members during the past two years for improvements in physical facilities?

4.4 Utilization of Diverse Institutional Resources

Institutions of higher education, especially multi-purpose institutions, have human, instructional, physical, and financial resources that can be used by many units within the institution. For example, a university may support psychological clinics, speech clinics, language laboratories, specialized libraries, child development centers, computer centers, and similar facilities that could be of use in the teacher education program. An institution thoroughly committed to teacher education will make such resources available to it. However, the faculty for teacher education will need to discern the potential of such resources and to devise means for actualizing this potential.

THE STANDARD

4.4 The diverse resources of the institution are available and used in support of teacher education.

4.41 What potential resources in the institution (such as psychological clinics, speech clinics, language laboratories, specialized libraries, child development centers, and/or computer centers), *are available for use* to support the teacher education program?
4.42 What potential resources for teacher education in the institution are available for use but are not being used?

4.5 Clerical and Supporting Services

The major asset of an institution for preparing teachers is its faculty -- their experience, their preparation, their commitment to teacher education, and their performance. If faculty are dissipating their professional energies on subprofessional tasks, the quality of the instructional program is being compromised, and the institution is not receiving a good return for its investments in faculty. Clerical and supporting services are therefore essential to permit the faculty to fulfill their instructional and other professional responsibilities.

THE STANDARD

4.5 The faculty for teacher education is provided with essential clerical and other supporting services.

4.51 What is the plan and the rationale for allocating clerical and supporting services to the staff?
4.52 What provisions are made for supplying and reproducing instructional materials (such as transparencies, films, filmstrips, audiotapes, and/or videotapes)?
4.53 To what extent have requests from the teacher education faculty for clerical and other supporting services been honored?

---

5. EVALUATION

5.1 Evaluation of Graduates

No institution takes its commitment to prepare teachers seriously unless it tries to arrive at an honest evaluation of the quality of its graduates and those persons being recommended for professional certification.

The phrase "teacher it has prepared" in the standard may refer to students who have just completed the program or to teachers who completed the program at various times in the past. It is to be noted that the tasks of evaluating these two groups of "teachers it has prepared" are not identical.

It is recognized that the present means for making such evaluations are inadequate, and that there is an emerging interest on the part of institutions in the development of more adequate means. It is assumed in the standard not only that institutions should be evaluating the teachers it has prepared with the best means now available, but also that they should be developing improved means to make such evaluations.

THE STANDARD

5.1 The institution has evidence of the quality of the teachers it has prepared.

- 5.11 What means are now being used by the institution to evaluate the teachers it has prepared?
- 5.12 What procedures are being used to determine that prospective teachers at the time of graduation are competent in both components of the teacher education program (general studies and professional studies)?
- 5.13 What evidence indicates that the institution is keeping abreast of new developments in the evaluation of the teachers it has prepared?

5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Programs

Good evaluations of the teachers not only provide assessments, but also suggest new directions and areas in the program which need strengthening. It is assumed in the standard that the results from such evaluations will be reflected in appropriate modifications of the preparation program.

THE STANDARD

5.2 The institution uses the results obtained from evaluating the teachers it has prepared in the study, development, and improvement of its teacher education program.

- 5.21 What have the results of an evaluation of the teachers prepared by the institution revealed about the program?
- 5.22 What changes, if any, have been made in the teacher education program resulting from such evidence?

5.3 Long-Range Planning

It is customary for an institution to project plans for its future development. Long-range plans provide a basis for making decisions in such matters as increasing or limiting enrollment, introducing new programs, expanding present programs, or entering the field of graduate education. It is expected that the institution's projected plans will take into account the development of its teacher education program.

THE STANDARD

5.3 The institution has a long-range plan for its development and incorporates therein a plan for the development of its teacher education program.

5.31 What significant changes in teacher education, if any, are projected in the institution's long-range plans?
3.32 What evidence shows that the faculty for teacher education has participated in the formulation of the institution's long-range plans?

REVISIONS IN PART II: ADVANCED PROGRAMS

This supplement to the December 1967 draft of the the proposed new accreditation standards for teacher education includes the revisions made by the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, April 3-4, 1968. These revisions have been incorporated in the proposed new standards for the Feasibility Project during which the standards will be tested in eight pilot institutions.

Page 24 -- Change the heading for Part II to -

Programs Beyond the Baccalaureate Level for the Advanced Preparation of Teachers and Specialized School Personnel

Page 24 -- Under the standard, G-1.1, change the numbers of the questions to *G-1.11 and G-1.12* respectively.

Page 25 -- In the standard, G-1.3, delete the word "*school.*"

Page 26 -- Change standard G-1.8 and the questions which follow the standard to read (the preamble remains the same) -

THE STANDARD

G-1.8 Some period of full-time residence study is required for candidates pursuing advanced degrees other than the doctorate; at least one academic year of full-time residence study is required for candidates pursuing the doctorate.

G-1.81 What are the institution's regulations concerning full-time residence study for the advanced degrees?

G-1.82 What information shows that candidates who have earned advanced degrees other than the doctorate during the past two years have completed a period of full-time residence study?

G-1.83 What information shows that candidates who have earned the doctorate during the past two years have completed at least one academic year of full-time residence study?

G-1.84 What evidence shows that each graduate assistantship enhances the program of study of the student holding the assistantship?

Page 27 -- Under G-2.3, Quality and Size of Faculty in Education, add the following sentence as the last sentence in the preamble:

It is not assumed in the standard that there must be a different group of "five persons holding doctorates in complementary fields" for each specialization field, the standard allows appropriate over-lapping among the respective specialization fields.

Page 28 -- Under G-2.5, Faculty Load, delete question *G-2.57.*

Page 30 -- Insert a new standard, *G-3.5*, as follows:

G-3.5 Student Involvement in the Graduate Programs in Education

As constituents of the higher education community, graduate students should feel free, individually and collectively, to express their views on the programs offered. They should, through their own organizations, through joint student-faculty groups, or as representatives to faculty committees, have clear channels and frequent opportunities to communicate their views on the adequacy and development of the graduate programs in education.

THE STANDARD

G-3.5 The institution makes provision for the expression of views of graduate students on the graduate programs in education.

G-3.51 What evidende shows that students are consulted by the faculty and administration on matters relating to the graduate programs in education?

G-3.52 What evidence is there that the college or university protects the right of the student to take reasoned exception to the views presented in any course in the graduate programs in education?

G-3.53 What are the major concerns which the students have expressed about the graduate programs in education during the past two years?

F

[illegible] INSTRUMENT FOR THE [illegible] PROJECT
January [illegible]

Name of respondent ______________________________

Institution ______________________________

Responsibility in Project ______________________________

To assist AACTE's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee in assessing the workability of the proposed new accreditation standards for teacher education, please complete as much of this instrument as you can in accord with your assignment in the Project.

Directions

FOR CHARTS #1 AND #2

Clarity	Check the appropriate cell in columns 3, 4, or 5 which indicates the degree of clarity in the preambles, standards, and/or questions.
Data Availability	Indicate with a check in column 6, 7, or 8 the extent of problems faced in collecting appropriate data for the institutional report.
Flexibility	It is hoped that the proposed standards are appropriately flexible, that is, they allow for several acceptable ways to meet a standard, without being so flexible that any solution can satisfy it. Indicate with a check in column 9, 10, or 11 the degree of flexibility of each standard.
"Pay-off"	In column 12 or 13, indicate with a check which standards have the highest and lowest "pay-off" value. A blank cell means that the standard is not particularly high or low. By"pay-off" we mean the extent to which a standard elicits evidence that is most useful in determining accreditability.
Overlap	In column 10, indicate the number of the standards with which there is unnecessary overlap.

Provide additional details or explanations for any of the items as desired on the blank pages following the charts.

FOR THE QUESTIONS

The questions deal with specific areas that relate to the workability of the proposed standards. Please consider each question and answer as many as you can in accord with your assignment in the Project.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
[illegible]

3

Chart #1 - BASIC PROGRAMS

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value		Overlaps with:
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
General Studies	1.1												
Prof. Studies	1.2												
Teaching Specialty	1.3												
H&B Studies	1.4												
Theory & Lab.	1.5												
Theory & Clinical	1.6												
Practicum	1.7												
Research & Dev.	1.8												
Control	1.9												
Faculty	2.1												
Quality	2.2												
Load	2.3												
Assignment	2.4												
Prof. Involvement	2.5												
Stud. Admissions	3.1												
Norms	3.2												
Acad. Screening	3.3												
Personal Traits	3.4												
Advisement	3.5												
Stud. Involvement	3.6												
Library	4.1												
Instruct. Media	4.2												
Facilities	4.3												
Support	4.4												
Aux. Services	4.5												
Quality of Prod.	5.1												
Eval. & Follow-up	5.2												
Long Range Plans	5.3												

Chart #2 - ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value		Overlaps with:
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Purpose of Prog.	G 1.1												
Content of Prog.	G 1.2												
Practicum	G 1.3												
Research	G 1.4												
Prog. Individualization	G 1.5												
Credit	G 1.6												
Courses	G 1.7												
Residency	G 1.8												
Control	G 1.9												
Faculty	G 2.1												
Quality	G 2.2												
Size	G 2.3												
Assignment	G 2.4												
Load	G 2.5												
Research Invol.	G 2.6												
Grad. Admissions	G 3.1												
Screening	G 3.2												
Supervision	G 3.3												
Quality	G 3.4												
Student Involvement	G 3.5												
Library	G 4.1												
Facilities	G 4.2												
Resources	G 4.3												
Support	G 4.4												
Research	G 4.5												
Evaluation	G 5.1												
Improvement	G 5.2												
Long Range Plans	G 5.3												

QUESTIONS

1. To what extent do the 28 standards as grouped in the five sections of Part I (program, faculty, students, resources and evaluation) enable institutional personnel to conceptualize what constitutes acceptable quality with respect to basic programs? Point out those sections or areas where you feel there are deficiences or omissions.

2. To what extent do the 28 standards as grouped in the five sections of Part II enable institutional personnel to conceptualize what constitutes acceptable quality with respect to advanced programs? Point out those sections or areas where you feel there are deficiencies or omissions.

3. Concerning the format of the document, you have noted that there are preambles, standards and questions. Has there been any confusion with respect to knowing what is the function of each and how they relate to the evaluation? Explain any indecision or confusion. Comment otherwise on the format.

4. With respect to the preparation of an institutional report for NCATE, do the preambles, standards and questions with the introductory statement contained in the document provide sufficient direction for developing an adequate description of your institution's teacher education programs? Is there a need for some kind of guide in a more formal sense? If so, what should such a guide contain?

5. To what extent do the new standards afford an opportunity to provide a comprehensive picture of those programs that may be described as experimental or innovative? Do the new standards promote or restrict institutional activity with respect to such programs?

6. It is expected that some of the new standards will be more stimulative to institutions than others. Identify and comment on those standards which you found to be most stimulative.

7. To what extent do the new standards ask for data and evidence which are not available at your institution? Are such data and evidence of a type that should be available? List the standards or questions that apply.

8. Do any of the standards require a degree of institutional effort that is not justified by the amount of usable data and evidence produced? If so, list those standards by number and explain your reasons for selecting them.

9. To what extent were the guidelines of the several professional organizations useful in studying and evaluating your institution's teacher education programs? In what ways might the usefulness of these guidelines be increased? What recommendations would you make to professional organizations relative to the development of more effective guidelines?

10. The new standards go much farther than the present ones in seeking to evaluate the quality of the product. What problems were encountered in providing evidence about the quality of your institution's graduates?

11. For the Feasibility Project, the usual visiting team role has been modified to include a preliminary visit by the team chairman and the reporting of judgments by the team. What are your reactions to this changed role?

12. To what extent were students involved in the self-study and the preparation of the institutional report?

January 13, 1969

KM:sb

G

EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT FOR THE AACTE/NCATE FEASIBILITY PROJECT
January 1969

Name of team member ______________________

Institution visited ______________________

Team Assignment ______________________

To assist AACTE's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee in assessing the workability of the proposed new accreditation standards for teacher education, please complete as much of this instrument as you can in accord with your assignment in the Project.

Directions

FOR CHARTS #1 AND #2

Clarity	Check the appropriate cell in columns 3, 4, or 5 which indicates the degree of clarity in the preambles, standards, and/or questions.
Data Availability	Indicate with a check in column 6, 7, or 8 the extent of problems faced in collecting appropriate data for the institutional report.
Flexibility	It is hoped that the proposed standards are appropriately flexible, that is, they allow for several acceptable ways to meet a standard, without being so flexible that any solution can satisfy it. Indicate with a check in column 9, 10, or 11 the degree of flexibility of each standard.
"Pay-off"	In column 12 or 13, indicate with a check which standards have the highest and lowest "pay-off" value. A blank cell means that the standard is not particularly high or low. By"pay-off" we mean the extent to which a standard elicits evidence that is most useful in determining accreditability.
Overlap	In column 10, indicate the number of the standards with which there is unnecessary overlap.

Provide additional details or explanations for any of the items as desired on the blank pages following the charts.

FOR THE QUESTIONS

The questions deal with specific areas that relate to the workability of the proposed standards. Please consider each question and answer as many as you can in accord with your assignment in the Project.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
1750 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006

Chart #1 - BASIC PROGRAMS

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value		Overlaps with:
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
General Studies	1.1												
Prof. Studies	1.2												
Teaching Specialty	1.3												
H&B Studies	1.4												
Theory & Lab.	1.5												
Theory & Clinical	1.6												
Practicum	1.7												
Research & Dev.	1.8												
Control	1.9												
Faculty	2.1												
Quality	2.2												
Load	2.3												
Assignment	2.4												
Prof. Involvement	2.5												
Stud. Admissions	3.1												
Norms	3.2												
Acad. Screening	3.3												
Personal Traits	3.4												
Advisement	3.5												
Stud. Involvement	3.6												
Library	4.1												
Instruct. Media	4.2												
Facilities	4.3												
Support	4.4												
Aux. Services	4.5												
Quality of Prod.	5.1												
Eval. & Follow-up	5.2												
Long Range Plans	5.3												

Chart #2 - ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Standard	No.	Clarity			Data availability			Flexibility			"Pay-off" value		Overlaps with:
		Clear	Doubtful	Not clear	No problems	No serious problems	Definite problems	Too restrictive	Appropriately flexible	Not restrictive enough	High	Low	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Purpose of Prog.	G 1.1												
Content of Prog.	G 1.2												
Practicum	G 1.3												
Research	G 1.4												
Prog. Individualization	G 1.5												
Credit	G 1.6												
Courses	G 1.7												
Residency	G 1.8												
Control	G 1.9												
Faculty	G 2.1												
Quality	G 2.2												
Size	G 2.3												
Assignment	G 2.4												
Load	G 2.5												
Research Invol.	G 2.6												
Grad. Admissions	G 3.1												
Screening	G 3.2												
Supervision	G 3.3												
Quality	G 3.4												
Student Involvement	G 3.5												
Library	G 4.1												
Facilities	G 4.2												
Resources	G 4.3												
Support	G 4.4												
R[illegible]h	G 4.5												
Evaluation	G 5.1												
Improvement	G 5.2												
Long Range Plans	G 5.3												

QUESTIONS FOR VISITING TEAM MEMBERS

1. To what extent do the 28 standards as grouped in the five sections of Part I (program, faculty, students, resources and evaluation) enable you to conceptualize what constitutes acceptable quality with respect to basic programs? Point out those sections or areas where you feel there are deficiencies or omissions.

2. To what extent do the 28 standards as grouped in the five sections of Part II enable you to conceptualize what constitutes acceptable quality with respect to advanced programs? Point out those sections or areas where you feel there are deficiencies or omissions.

3. Concerning the format of the document, you have noted that there are preambles, standards and questions. Has there been any confusion with respect to knowing what is the function of each and how they relate to the evaluation? Explain any indecision of confusion. Comment otherwise on the format.

4. It is expected that some of the standards will be more stimulative than others. Identify and comment on those standards which you found to be most stimulative to the institution visited.

5. To what extent were the guidelines of the several professional organizations useful in evaluating the institution's teacher education programs? What recommendations would you make to professional organizations relative to the development of more useful and effective guidelines for preparing teachers?

6. Within each section of Part I and Part II (program, faculty, students, resources, evaluation), are any of the standards more discriminating than others in identifying strengths and weaknesses of the respective elements in the institution's teacher education program? If so, identify those standards and briefly discuss your reasons for selecting them.

7. What is your assessment of the role of the visiting team as set forth in the Feasibility Project? On the basis of your experience, what changes would you suggest?

8. Based on your experience with the temporary document, what suggestions do you have for the development of a permanent manual for visiting teams using the proposed standards?

9. What were the major problems encountered by the team in validating the institution's report? To what extent are these problems related to the nature of the standards? To the adequacy of the institutional report?

10. What were the major problems encountered by the team in arriving at its judgments? To what extent are these problems related to the nature of the standards?

11. What judgments about the institution's teacher education programs are best made after an on-site visit?

12. To what extent does the nature and scope of the standards produce interaction between members of the visiting team and key institutional personnel? To what extent does the role of the team produce such interaction?

January 15, 1969
KM:sb

H

recommended standards for teacher education

the accreditation of basic and advanced preparation programs for professional school personnel

Prepared by the
Evaluative Criteria
Study Committee
and adopted by the
Executive Committee
of AACTE
for transmittal to the
National Council
for Accreditation
of Teacher Education

Approved by
NCATE, January 1970

March 1970

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

This report includes the results of pilot-testing an earlier draft of these standards which was done pursuant to Contract No. OEC-3-8-080248-0030(010) with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

First Printing, November 1969
Second Printing, March 1970

Standard Book Number 910052-41-7
Library of Congress Catalog Number 74-107867

Contents

Foreword
Introduction

Part I: Basic Teacher Education Programs

PROGRAMS FOR THE INITIAL PREPARATION OF TEACHERS THROUGH THE FIFTH-YEAR LEVEL, INCLUDING M.A.T. PROGRAMS

1. Curricula for Basic Programs
1.1 Design of Curricula 3
1.2 The General Studies Component 3
1.3 The Professional Studies Component 4
  1.3.1 Content for the Teaching Specialty 4
  1.3.2 Humanistic and Behavioral Studies 5
  1.3.3 Teaching and Learning Theory With Laboratory and Clinical Experience 5
  1.3.4 Practicum 6
1.4 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations 6
1.5 Control of Basic Programs 7

2. Faculty for Basic Programs
2.1 Competence and Utilization of Faculty 7
2.2 Faculty Involvement with Schools 8
2.3 Conditions for Faculty Service 8
2.4 Part-time Faculty 9

3. Students in Basic Programs
3.1 Admission to Basic Programs 9
3.2 Retention of Students in Basic Programs 10
3.3 Counseling and Advising for Students in Basic Programs 10
3.4 Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Development 10

4. Resources and Facilities for Basic Programs
4.1 Library 11
4.2 Materials and Instructional Media Center 11
4.3 Physical Facilities and Other Resources 12

5. Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning
5.1 Evaluation of Graduates 12
5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Basic Programs 12
5.3 Long-Range Planning 13

Part II: Advanced Programs

POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS FOR THE ADVANCED PREPARATION OF TEACHERS AND THE PREPARATION OF OTHER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

G-1. Curricula for Advanced Programs
G-1.1 Design of Curricula 14
G-1.2 Content of Curricula 14
G-1.3 Research in Advanced Curricula 15
G-1.4 Individualization of Programs of Study 15
G-1.5 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations 16
G-1.6 Quality Controls 16
  G-1.6.1 Graduate Credit 16
  G-1.6.2 Graduate Level Courses 16
  G-1.6.3 Residence Study 16
G-1.7 Control of Advanced Programs 17

G-2. Faculty for Advanced Programs
G-2.1 Preparation of Faculty 17
G-2.2 Composition of Faculty for Doctoral Degree Programs 18
G-2.3 Conditions for Faculty Service 18
G-2.4 Part-time Faculty 19

G-3. Students in Advanced Programs
G-3.1 Admission to Advanced Programs 19
G-3.2 Retention of Students in Advanced Programs 20
G-3.3 Planning and Supervision of Students' Programs of Study 20
G-3.4 Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Development 20

G-4. Resources and Facilities for Advanced Programs
G-4.1 Library 21
G-4.2 Physical Facilities and Other Resources 21

G-5. Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning
G-5.1 Evaluation of Graduates 21
G-5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Advanced Programs 22
G-5.3 Long-Range Planning 22

Foreword

These recommended standards for teacher education are the culmination of an intensive three-year study sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education under the leadership of its Evaluative Criteria Study Committee. They represent another step in the unending process to improve the accreditation of teacher education. While developed primarily for accreditation purposes, they may also be viewed as general guidelines for the improvement of preparation programs for professional school personnel.

These standards were recommended by the AACTE Executive Committee to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education for adoption and were unanimously approved by the Council at its January 1970 meeting in New Orleans. They become effective for all institutions seeking accreditation or reaccreditation by NCATE during the 1971-1972 school year. Prior to that time, institutions may elect to be evaluated on the basis of either the former or the new standards. Information regarding preparation for an accreditation visit may be obtained from the Director of NCATE, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

The AACTE developed these standards in response to its mandate from the National Commission on Accrediting as put forth in the NCATE constitution to continuously evaluate and revise the accreditation standards. The Association acknowledges that they are not, and should not be, the final word in standards for accrediting teacher education. It recognizes that standards must be systematically reviewed and revised in terms of experience in using them, in light of societal changes, and in relation to advances in the state of the art of educating professional school personnel. The AACTE takes seriously its assigned responsibility and is committed to provide leadership for the continuous evaluation and revision of these standards.

The pattern of involvement which has characterized the development of these new standards is envisioned as a guide for evaluating and revising them in the future. Representatives of colleges and universities engaged in teacher education, learned societies and professional associations, state departments of education, the teaching profession, and teacher education students participated in the development of these recommendations. The Committee conducted an opinion survey of the former NCATE standards, prepared and distributed resource materials, and sponsored regional conferences to discuss relevant issues and to collect ideas for improving standards. It wrote preliminary drafts, submitted them to the field for reaction, and revised them accordingly. In cooperation with NCATE and under a contract with the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education, the Committee then tested the feasibility of the proposed new standards in eight colleges and universities, and it further revised its proposals in light of the test results. Through intense and protracted effort, the Committee has endeavored to maintain a unified rationale for standards while reconciling many and different points of view submitted by participants in the study.

The AACTE wishes to express its appreciation to the many persons, institutions, and agencies for their many contributions of time and resources without which these standards could not have been developed. In the final analysis, the indirect results of the process utilized in this study may be as significant as the standards themselves. In support of this process, the financial assistance of the ESSO Education Foundation and the U. S. Steel Foundation supplemented in a significant way the funding provided by the Association and its member institutions.

The quality of these recommended standards has been made possible by the insightful views concerning teacher education contributed by members of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee. Special words of commendation are presented to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and its director, Rolf Larson, for their cooperation and assistance during the Feasibility Project; to Edwin P. Adkins and Paul F. Sharp, Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, for their untiring leadership; and to Karl Massanari for the total commitment of his many talents to the success of this venture. Members of the Committee and staff are identified on the following page.

EDWARD C. POMEROY
Executive Director, AACTE

March, 1970

Evaluative Criteria Study Committee

Chairman—Edwin P. Adkins, Associate Vice President, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vice Chairman—Paul F. Sharp, President, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

Harry S. Broudy, Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Robert N. Bush, Professor of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Margaret Knispel, Assistant Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Washington, D. C.

Margaret Lindsey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

Warren C. Lovinger, President, Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri

Robert MacVicar, Chancellor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

Sister Mary Emil, Director of Educational Research, Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan

E. C. Merrill, President, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C.

Harold Shane, University Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Kimball Wiles, Dean, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

(Dr. Wiles' untimely death in February 1968 brought to a close a term of service marked by distinction and dedication.)

Staff

Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary, AACTE, and Director of the AACTE/NCATE Feasibility Project

Richard L. James, Associate Secretary, AACTE, and Associate Director of the AACTE/NCATE Feasibility Project

Shirley Bonneville, Secretary, AACTE

Introduction

National accreditation of college and university programs for the preparation of all teachers and other professional school personnel at the elementary and secondary levels is the exclusive responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE has been authorized by the National Commission on Accrediting to adopt standards and procedures for accreditation and to determine the accreditation status of institutional programs for preparing teachers and other professional school personnel.

Purposes of National Accreditation of Teacher Education

National accreditation of teacher education serves four major purposes:

1. To assure the public that particular institutions—those named in the Annual List—offer programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel that meet national standards of quality
2. To ensure that children and youth are served by well-prepared school personnel
3. To advance the teaching profession through the improvement of preparation programs
4. To provide a practical basis for reciprocity among the states in certifying professional school personnel.

Institutional Self-Governance and National Accreditation

Both public and private institutions of higher learning in the United States have a long heritage of self-governance. The right of colleges and universities to set their own goals and to shape their own destinies has accounted for a large measure of the excellence—perhaps inadequacy as well—which is found among institutions of higher learning today. The freedom of institutions to move toward higher levels of excellence should be encouraged and supported by national accreditation. When accreditation distracts an institution from this mission, or encroaches upon its freedom to accomplish it, the accreditation process becomes incompatible with its own purposes.

It is equally true, however, that national accreditation can exert a countervailing force when institutions aspire to expand programs beyond the capacity of available resources and when they offer marginal or poor programs. National accreditation represents a common floor of acceptability. Each institution of higher learning is free to seek or not to seek national accreditation.

National Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education certifies that the institution's programs for preparing teachers and other professional school personnel meet the standards. The institution is expected to meet the standards at a level judged acceptable at the time of its evaluation. However, in a profession where the state of the art is constantly improving, the level should be expected to rise. NCATE accreditation validates the quality of preparation programs and signifies that persons recommended by the institution can be expected to perform satisfactorily in typical teaching and other professional school positions throughout the United States. While the standards which are applied to programs are "minimum standards" for acceptability, the NCATE urges institutions to set higher standards for themselves and to strive for better ways to prepare teachers and other professional school personnel.

Continuous Review of NCATE Standards

The Constitution of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Article VII, Section B) states:

> Responsibility for carrying on a systematic program of evaluation of standards and development of new and revised standards shall be allocated to the AACTE. The AACTE shall ensure the participation of representatives of institutions, organizations and fields of study concerned with teacher education, and the Council. The AACTE shall receive and consider recommendations about existing or revised standards from institutions which prepare teachers and from individuals and organizations concerned with teacher education.

The AACTE is carrying out this responsibility with maximum participation of those persons and organizations most directly concerned with accreditation standards.

The NCATE is committed to the proposition that its standards should reflect changing conditions in higher education generally and in teacher education in particular. This means that the standards will not remain static nor be pegged to any level of excellence, and that, from time to time, the floor of acceptability will be raised.

Applicability of NCATE Standards

The NCATE standards are divided into two parts: Part I, Basic Programs and Part II, Advanced Programs. The standards in Part I are to be applied to all *basic* programs: programs for the initial preparation of teachers (nursery school through secondary school) including five-year and M.A.T. programs. They are not applicable to programs for the preparation of teacher aides or other paraprofessionals.

The standards in Part II are to be applied to all *advanced* programs: programs beyond the baccalaureate level and beyond the basic programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. They are not applicable to programs for the preparation of college teachers.

The standards in both Part I and Part II apply to all institutional programs leading to degrees or certificates regardless of the location and time at which the instruction takes place.

Eligibility for NCATE Accreditation

Degree-granting institutions are eligible for an evaluation by NCATE if they offer programs for the preparation of teachers and/or other professional school personnel, are accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association, and are approved by the appropriate state department of education at the levels and in the categories for which NCATE accreditation is sought. While an institution is expected to present for review *all* of its programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel, only those programs from which some students have been graduated are eligible for accreditation.

The Council regards accreditation by a regional accrediting association as reasonable assurance of the overall quality of an institution, including its general financial stability, the effectiveness of its administration, the adequacy of its general facilities, the quality of its student personnel program, the strength of its faculty, the adequacy of its faculty personnel policies, the conditions of faculty service, and the quality of instruction.

An institution accepted for evaluation shall present for review:

1. *All basic programs:* programs offered for the initial preparation of nursery-school through secondary-school teachers (programs resulting in the recommendation for professional certification), whether they are four-year, five-year or M.A.T. programs; and/or
2. *All advanced programs:* programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the advanced preparation of teachers and for the preparation of other professional school personnel.

NCATE Standards and Institutional Reports

Each of the standards which follows has a preamble which gives the rationale for the standard, interprets its meaning, and defines terms. The preamble therefore is to be interpreted as part of the standard which it precedes. Following each standard are questions designed to elicit information and evidence to show the extent to which the institution possesses the characteristics identified in the standard and its preamble.

Institutions of higher education seeking accreditation or re-accreditation by NCATE are expected to prepare a report based on the preambles, standards, and questions which follow the standards. It is expected that all of the questions will be answered in the institution's report. It is not assumed, however, that the questions included for each standard are exhaustive; an institution may provide other information to show that it possesses the characteristics described in a standard and its preamble.

Institutional Experimentation and Innovation

Responsible experimentation and innovation are essential to improvement of teacher education programs. A deliberate attempt has been made in these standards to encourage individuality, imagination, and innovation in institutional planning. An institution must, of course, assume responsibility for the quality of all its programs, regular and experimental.

Colleges and universities are responding to pressing social needs by developing programs to prepare teachers with special competencies or to prepare new types of teachers. These programs are subject to the same scrutiny as are the other teacher education programs offered by the institution. In some instances, the standards as organized may not provide the best vehicle for assessing such programs. In these cases, the institution is invited to present its experimental or special programs separately. Such presentations should include the rationale for the design of the programs, for admitting students who do not meet the usual criteria for admission, for using faculty members who do not meet the usual requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty, and should show that systematic efforts are being made to evaluate the graduates of these programs.

Part I: Basic Teacher Education Programs

Programs for the Initial Preparation of Teachers Through the Fifth-Year Level, Including M.A.T. Programs

1. Curricula for Basic Programs

Curricula for teacher education are designed to achieve explicitly stated objectives. These objectives are determined in relation to both the professional roles for which the preparation programs are designed and the behavioral outcomes sought. It is assumed that the design of each curriculum for the preparation of teachers adopted by the institution reflects the judgment of appropriate members of the faculty and staff, of students, of graduates, and of the profession as a whole. It is also assumed that these curricula reflect an awareness of research and development in teacher education.

Colleges and universities are responding to current pressing social needs by developing programs to prepare teachers with special competencies such as teachers for bilingual children, teachers for "disadvantaged children," teachers to work in teaching teams, teachers to teach in ungraded schools, and teachers with an international component as part of their training. These programs, often special or experimental in nature, are subject to the same scrutiny as are the other teacher education programs offered by the institution. In some instances, the standards, as organized, may not provide the best vehicle for reviewing such programs. In these cases, the institution is invited to present its experimental or special programs separately as noted in the Introduction.

As used in the following standards, a "teacher education program" refers to the curriculum, the teaching, the learning, and the supporting resources for the teaching and learning process. "Curriculum" includes the courses, seminars, readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, and practicum as described under the general studies component and the professional studies component. A "program of study" refers to the sequence of courses, seminars, readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, and practicum selected for each student.

1.1 Design of Curricula

Curricula for the preparation of teachers are composed of several components combined in patterns designed to achieve the objectives sought. These patterns are based on assumptions which can be identified by the institution and which reveal themselves in what is done in classroom, laboratory, and field experiences.

Standard: *Teacher education curricula are based on objectives reflecting the institution's conception of the teacher's role, and are organized to include general studies, content for the teaching specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and practicum.*

1.1.1 What information shows that each basic teacher education program is designed to achieve objectives reflecting the institution's analysis of the teacher's role?

1.1.2 What information shows that each curriculum in teacher education includes the elements identified in the standard?

1.2 The General Studies Component

Prospective teachers, like all other students, need a sound general education. However, their need is accentuated by the nature of the professional responsibilities that they are expected to assume. As teachers, they are destined to play an important role in providing general education for the children and youth they teach, and to serve as adequate models of educated persons to their students. Furthermore, the subjects studied in general education may be needed to support their teaching specialties.

Institutional programs of general or liberal studies vary widely although certain elements are usually present in all of them. Such variation precludes prescribing the general studies in terms of subject and credit hours. The view reflected in the standard is that general education should include the studies most widely generalizable. Far more important than the specific content of the general studies is that they be taught with emphasis upon generalization rather than with academic specialization as a primary objective. It is assumed, moreover, that programs of study in general education are individualized according to the needs and interests of students. It is further assumed that the selection of content for the general studies component is determined jointly by faculty members in the academic areas and those in teacher education.

As used in the standard, "symbolics of information" is that part of the general studies which deals with communication through symbols, including studies in such areas as languages, communication skills, linguistics, mathematics, logic, and information theory. "Natural and behavioral sciences" and "humanities" follow their common usage in higher education.

It is the intent of the standard to designate a minimum limit for general studies and to encourage institutions to exceed it. "One-third," as specified in the standards, is applicable to four-year curricula for prospective teachers.

Standard: *There is a planned general studies component requiring that at least one-third of each curriculum for prospective teachers consist of studies in the symbolics of information, natural and behavioral sciences, and humanities.*

1.2.1 What courses, seminars, and readings are offered in each area of general studies identified in the standard?

1.2.2 What are the arrangements for ensuring that courses, seminars, and readings are distributed among the areas of general studies as specified in the standard?

1.2.3 What evidence shows that the program of study of each student meets the institution's requirements in general studies?

1.2.4 What evidence (such as state and regional accreditation reports and/or student achievement data) reflects the quality of the general studies component?

1.2.5 What information shows that some initial assessment is made of the level and quality of the general education background of each student and that each program of study is accordingly individualized?

1.2.6 How does the institution ensure that the selection of content for the general studies component embodies the judgment of both the academic staff and the teacher education faculty?

1.3 The Professional Studies Component

The professional part of a curriculum designed to prepare teachers should be distinguishable from the general studies component: the latter includes whatever instruction is deemed desirable for all students, regardless of their prospective occupation; the former—professional—component covers all requirements that are justified by the work of the specific profession of teaching. In the standards that follow it is assumed, therefore, that the classification of a study as general or professional does not depend on the name of the study or the department in which the instruction is offered; it depends rather on the function the study is to perform.

The designation of the elements in the professional studies component (as delineated in standards 1.3.1 through 1.3.4) is not intended to prescribe a particular design for teacher education. Rather, it is intended to provide a set of categories through which an institution can describe and review the professional studies component of the various teacher education curricula it offers. It is assumed that these elements can be identified in any acceptable design for teacher education.

1.3.1 Content for the Teaching Specialty. The "Content for the Teaching Specialty" is included in the professional studies component of the curriculum to direct attention to the central importance of appropriate subject matter in a teaching specialty in the professional preparation of the teacher. It does not imply that such subject matter should be professionalized nor that the instruction should be provided in any specific school or department or in any particular format, such as "courses." The instruction in the subject matter for the teaching specialties is the basic responsibility of the respective academic departments; the identification and selection of courses and other learning experiences required for a teaching specialty, however, are the joint responsibility of appropriate members of the faculty in the teaching specialty concerned and members of the teacher education faculty. Joint responsibility for determining the content of a teaching specialty should result in content that is peculiarly relevant to teaching.

The standard draws attention to the fact that teaching requires two types of knowledge which may extend beyond what is required in general studies. One is the knowledge that is to be taught to the pupil; the other is the knowledge that may be needed by the teacher as a background for the teaching of his particular specialty. It is assumed in the standard that both kinds of knowledge are a required part of the candidate's professional training.

"Teaching specialty" as used in the standard includes elementary education as a specialized field as well as the various specializations offered in the secondary school.

Standard: *The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes the study of the content to be taught to pupils; and the supplementary knowledge, from the subject matter of the teaching specialty and from allied fields, that is needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching.*

1.3.1 a What evidence shows that the program of study of each prospective teacher includes both types of content for the teaching specialty identified in the standard?

1.3.1 b What information shows that the selection of courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialty in each curriculum embodies the judgment of members of the faculty in the teaching specialty concerned and members of the teacher education faculty?

1.3.1 c What are the provisions for ensuring that a systematic effort is made to keep the content of the respective teaching specialties current with developments in the appropriate disciplines as they relate to teaching?

1.3.2 Humanistic and Behavioral Studies. Many disciplines are important in the preparation of teachers. However, not all disciplines are equally relevant, and their relevance is not always obvious. In the following standard it is assumed that problems concerning the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, the organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching and learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the philosophical issues to which they are related. These studies are referred to hereafter as the humanistic studies. The problems of education can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science. Such studies are referred to as behavioral studies. These humanistic and behavioral studies differ from the usual study of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science in that they address themselves to the problems of education. The major purpose of such studies is to provide the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood and interpreted.

The humanistic and behavioral studies require a familiarity with the parent disciplines on which they are based. This familiarity may be acquired as part of the general studies and/or as part of the content for the teaching specialty.

The standard does not imply that instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies should be organized or structured in a particular way. Instruction in these studies may be offered in such courses as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education; or as an integral part of such courses as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology; or as topics in foundation courses, problems in education courses, or in professional block programs; or as independent readings.

Standard: *The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes instruction in the humanistic studies and the behavioral studies.*

1.3.2 a What humanistic and behavioral studies are part of the professional component of each curriculum, and what is the supporting rationale for including them?

1.3.2 b What information shows that these studies are oriented toward the problems of education, such as the nature and aims of education, curriculum, organization and administration, teaching and learning?

1.3.2 c What information shows that the instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies incorporates the findings of research and scholarly writings, and provides experiences for students in their interpretation and use?

1.3.2 d What data show that the programs of study of all prospective teachers include the humanistic and behavioral studies prescribed by the institution?

1.3.3 Teaching and Learning Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience. As distinguished from the Content for the Teaching Specialty and the Humanistic and Behavioral Studies, there is a body of knowledge about teaching and learning that should be the basis for effective performance. If teaching is to be more than a craft, teachers need to understand the theoretical principles which explain what they do. For this reason, the study of teaching and learning theory is included as part of the professional studies component. However, like the study of other empirical theory, the study of teaching and learning theory requires laboratory experiences through which the student may conceptualize principles and interpret their application to practical problems. Much of what has been called "general methods" and "special methods" can therefore be taught as the application of teaching and learning theory.

Whereas the study of teaching and learning theory provides the prospective teacher with principles of practice, and the laboratory exercises illuminate and demonstrate these principles, clinical experience confronts the student with individual cases or problems, the diagnosis and solution of which involve the application of principles and theory. Certain kinds of problems (such as planning, selection of learning resources, motivation, presentation, diagnosis of learning difficulties, individualization of instruction, classroom management, and evaluation) represent recurring types of classroom situations. Clinical teaching involves the student in the diagnosis and "treatment" of the individual problem, under the guidance of an experienced teacher. Because it is now possible to simulate many of these situations or to display a selection of real problems electronically—and because the prospective teacher's efforts can be recorded, viewed, and reviewed —it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the school classroom.

Standard: *The professional studies component of each curriculum includes the systematic study of teaching* *and learning theory with appropriate laboratory and clinical experience.*

1.3.3 a In what courses, seminars, and readings are provisions made for the study of teaching and learning theory?

1.3.3 b What practices or procedures show that the study of teaching and learning theory requires and is accompanied by laboratory experiences (observation, demonstration, problem-solving, tutoring, microteaching, and/or other direct experiential activities)?

1.3.3 c What are the provisions for clinical experience (diagnosing and treating individual typical cases, practices, or problems)?

1.3.3 d What information shows that the instruction in the study of teaching and learning theory incorporates the findings of research and other scholarly writings, and provides experiences for students in their interpretation and use?

1.3.3 e What data indicate that all prospective teachers have laboratory and clinical experiences under the guidance of an experienced teacher?

1.3.3 f What evidence shows that the programs of study of all prospective teachers include the systematic study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory and clinical experience?

1.3.4 Practicum. "Practicum" refers to a period of experience in professional practice during which the student tests and reconstructs the theory which he has evolved and during which he further develops his own teaching style. It provides an opportunity for the student to assume major responsibility for the full range of teaching duties in a real school situation under the guidance of qualified personnel from the institution and from the cooperating elementary or secondary school. It presupposes the learning experiences included in all other professional studies; it is not a substitute for them. It is a more complete and concrete learning activity than laboratory and clinical experience.

It is assumed that the institution carefully selects the cooperating schools used for practicum and that it establishes effective working arrangements with these schools.

Practicum in most situations may be called student teaching; in some situations it may be a type of internship.

Standard: *The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes direct substantial participation in teaching over an extended period of time under the supervision of qualified personnel from the institution and the cooperating school.*

1.3.4 a What evidence shows that every prospective teacher assumes substantial responsibility over an extended period of time for the range of teaching duties in the professional role for which he is being prepared?

1.3.4 b What information shows that relationships between professional personnel in the institution and in the cooperating schools contribute positively to students' experience in practicum?

1.3.4 c What evidence confirms that the supervision of students in practicum is organized and executed under the direction of qualified personnel from the institution?

1.3.4 d What information shows that the supervising teachers in the cooperating schools are superior teachers, are trained in supervision, and are committed to the task of educating teachers?

1.3.4 e What systematic methods are used to record or describe the teaching performance of students and how is the resulting data used by students and supervisors to analyze teaching behavior?

1.3.4 f How is the supervision of students in practicum translated into an index of faculty load? For how many students in practicum does each teacher education faculty member have responsibility?

1.4 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations

National learned societies and professional associations with special interest in curricula for the preparation of teachers have significant contributions to make to the improvement of teacher education programs. On the basis of extensive study and research, some of these organizations have developed guidelines for the preparation of teachers. It is expected that an institution will work out the rationale for its various teacher education curricula with due consideration given to such guidelines appropriate to the elements in the professional studies component. Due consideration means that the institution is acquainted with these guidelines and has critically examined them in relation to developing the teacher education curricula offered.

Standard: *In planning and developing curricula for teacher education, the institution gives due consideration to guidelines for teacher preparation developed by national learned societies and professional associations.*

1.4.1 What guidelines has the institution considered in developing the following elements of the professional studies component:

- a. The content for each teaching specialty offered?
- b. The humanistic and behavioral studies?
- c. Teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience?
- d. Practicum?

1.4.2 What information shows that the guidelines identified in 1.4.1 have been critically examined in relation to the planning and development of the curricula offered?

1.5 Control of Basic Programs

Administrative structure exists primarily as a practical arrangement for formulating and achieving goals, fixing responsibility, utilizing resources, and facilitating continuous development and improvement. The standard assumes that this principle is applicable to administrative units responsible for the preparation of teachers. It is expected that the particular unit within the institution officially designated as responsible for teacher education is composed of persons who have experience in, and commitment to, the task of educating teachers.

The standard does not prescribe any particular organizational structure. A unit as referred to below may take the form of a council, commission, committee, department, school, college, or other recognizable organizational entity.

While major responsibility for designing, approving, evaluating, and developing teacher education programs is carried by an officially designated unit, it is assumed that teacher education faculty members are systematically involved in the decision-making process.

Standard: *The design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development of teacher education programs are the primary responsibility of an officially designated unit; the majority of the membership of this unit is composed of faculty and/or staff members who are significantly involved in teacher education.*

1.5.1 What administrative unit within the institution has primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and what is the rationale for determining its membership and responsibilities?

1.5.2 What evidence shows that the majority of the membership of the official unit is made up of faculty and/or staff members significantly involved in teacher education?

1.5.3 What activities of the official unit during the past two years demonstrate that it has assumed responsibility for the design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development of each teacher education program offered by the institution?

1.5.4 What information shows that teacher education faculty members share in the decision-making process in matters related to designing, evaluating, and developing teacher education programs?

2. Faculty for Basic Programs

Teacher education programs require a competent faculty which has been systematically developed into a coherent body devoted to the preparation of effective teachers. The faculty is significantly involved in the evaluation and development of teacher education programs offered by the institution and is engaged in systematic efforts to improve the quality of instruction provided. The faculty constantly scrutinizes curricula in relation to the characteristics and needs of the students enrolled and in relation to the resources required to support the offering of acceptable programs. The following standards deal with significant aspects of faculty competence in relation to the development, execution, and review of teacher education programs; and with conditions for effective faculty performance.

"Faculty for teacher education" as used in standards 2.1 through 2.4 includes those faculty members responsible for the instruction in humanistic and behavioral studies, in teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and in practicum.

2.1 Competence and Utilization of Faculty

The competence of the faculty is the crucial factor in teacher education, not only for the quality of instruction which is provided, but also for the total atmosphere in which the programs are implemented. Above all, the quality of teacher education programs offered, and the degree to which such quality is maintained, depend primarily on the faculty.

The competence of faculty is established on the basis of academic preparation, experience, teaching, and scholarly performance. The standard assumes that advanced graduate work in a well-defined field of specialization, taken in a regionally accredited institution or a recognized foreign institution, is the minimal requirement for teaching in a collegiate institution. In certain cases, where the faculty member has not completed the requisite advanced graduate work, competence may be established on the basis of scholarly performance as reflected by publication, research, and/or recognition by professional peers in the faculty member's field of specialization.

An institution capitalizes on the academic and professional strength of its faculty by making assignments which make possible the maximum use of preparation and experience. An institution also relates faculty selection and assignment to faculty performance.

The standard does not preclude the offering of adequate programs of teacher education with a small faculty, but it does discourage the over-extension of faculty and the use of faculty in areas in which they are not competent. The standard does not require that faculty members be assigned to a particular school or department within the institution.

Standard: *An institution engaged in preparing teachers has full-time faculty members in teacher education, each with post-master's degree preparation and/or demonstrated scholarly competence, and each with appropriate specializations. Such specializations make possible competent instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies, in teaching and learning theory, and in the methods of teaching in each of the specialties for which the institution prepares teachers. There are appropriate specializations to ensure competent supervision of laboratory, clinical, and practicum experiences.*

2.1.1 What evidence indicates that there is a full-time faculty for teacher education with qualifications requisite to competent instruction in each of the areas specified in the standard?

2.1.2 What evidence shows that all courses and other learning experiences in each of the areas specified in the standard are actually conducted by faculty members appropriately prepared to do so?

2.1.3 If any faculty members have been teaching in fields for which they are not qualified, for how long and for what special reasons has this been permitted?

2.1.4 What is done to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction in each of the areas specified in the standard?

2.2 Faculty Involvement with Schools

Faculty members who instruct prospective teachers need frequent contacts with school environments so that their teaching and research are current and relevant. In addition, the commitment of a teacher education faculty is to the needs of the teaching profession as a whole as well as to institutional programs. It is assumed that elementary and secondary school personnel share with faculty members in colleges and universities a common purpose and interest in teacher education. The specialized talent of the teacher education faculty is viewed as a potential resource for providing in-service assistance to the schools in the area served by the institution.

Standard: *Members of the teacher education faculty have continuing association and involvement with elementary and secondary schools.*

2.2.1 In what ways have members of the faculty for teacher education been associated and involved with activities of elementary and secondary schools?

2.2.2 What information shows that such association and involvement are reflected in the institution's teacher education programs?

2.2.3 What information indicates that the special competencies of the teacher education faculty are reflected in the services offered to the schools?

2.3 Conditions for Faculty Service

The institution, recognizing that the faculty is the major determinant of the quality of its teacher education programs, makes provision for the efficient use of faculty competence, time, and energy. Such provisions include policies which establish maximum limits for teaching loads, permit adjustments in teaching loads when nonteaching duties are assigned, and allow time for the faculty member to do the planning involved in carrying out his assigned responsibilities.

To maintain and to improve the quality of its faculty, the institution has a plan for faculty development which provides such opportunities as in-service education, sabbatical leave, travel support, summer leaves, intra- and inter-institutional visitation, and fellowships. In addition, time is allocated in the load of a faculty member so that he can continue his scholarly development.

The institution recognizes that the quality of its instructional programs can be compromised if faculty members are dissipating their energy on subprofessional tasks. Therefore, provision is made for supporting services (such as those provided by instructional media technicians, laboratory and/or instructional assistants, research assistants, and secretaries and clerks) that permit faculty members to fulfill their instructional and other professional responsibilities at a high level of performance.

Standard: *The institution provides conditions essential to the effective performance by the teacher education faculty.*

2.3.1 What is the plan and its supporting rationale for taking into account all professional duties and activities of the faculty in determining load?

2.3.2 What is the assigned professional load (all services rendered) for each teacher education faculty member?

2.3.3 If the load of any faculty member exceeds the established institutional policy, for how long and for what reasons has this been permitted?

2.3.4 What program does the institution have for faculty development and what evidence shows that it is operative?

2.3.5 What is the plan for allocating supporting services to the faculty and what evidence shows that such services are provided?

2.4 Part-Time Faculty

Two kinds of situations support the employment of faculty on a part-time basis. One is the need of the institution for a special competence not represented on the regular staff and not requiring a full-time faculty member. The other is the need for additional service in areas of competence already represented on the full-time staff. However, in the interests of operating acceptable programs, the institution prevents the fragmentation of instruction and the erosion of program quality that can accompany excessive use of part-time faculty. It is assumed that the competence of part-time faculty as indicated by academic preparation, experience, teaching, and scholarly performance is comparable to that of full-time faculty.

Standard: *Part-time faculty meet the requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty and are employed only when they can make special contributions to the teacher education programs.*

2.4.1 What are the qualifications of the part-time faculty members in teacher education, and what proportion of the instruction in each curriculum is assigned to them?

2.4.2 What is the load, within and without the institution, for each part-time faculty member in teacher education?

2.4.3 What reasons support the use of each part-time faculty member in teacher education?

2.4.4 What provisions are made to ensure that part-time faculty members are oriented to the basic purposes of, and kept abreast of, current developments in the institution's teacher education programs?

3. Students in Basic Programs

Teacher education programs described above require students who have intellectual, emotional, and personal qualifications that promise to result in successful performance in the profession. Attention to the characteristics of students admitted to, retained in, and graduated from teacher education is essential to designing and maintaining acceptable programs. It is assumed that an institution selects and retains qualified students in its programs and eliminates those who should not go into teaching; that it provides counseling and advising services; that it provides opportunities for student participation in the evaluation and development of programs; and that it evaluates graduates. The evaluation of graduates is treated in another section of the standards.

In certain instances, institutions may wish to recognize the potential existing in students who do not qualify for admission by the usual criteria by offering special or experimental teacher education programs. In such cases, institutions will explain fully the rationale underlying admission and retention of students in these programs.

3.1 Admission to Basic Programs

Students seeking admission to programs of teacher education may have to meet requirements in addition to those generally prescribed for enrollment in the institution because there are skills, understandings, and personal characteristics which are unique to teaching. The institution, therefore, uses a number of criteria for admitting students to its teacher education programs. These criteria, both objective and subjective, reflect a rational process for selecting students whose success in the profession can be reasonably predicted.

No single criterion can as yet predict success or failure. This applies to scores on objective tests as well as to more subjective criteria. Nevertheless, scores on standardized tests are useful in predicting the probability of success in the program of studies prescribed for teacher education. Test scores also provide a basis on which institutions can determine how students entering their programs compare with external indicators of probable success.

The following standard applies to the selection of students in regular teacher education programs. For experimental or special programs, specific admission requirements should be indicated in the description of these programs.

Standard: *The institution applies specific criteria for admission to teacher education programs; these criteria require the use of both objective and subjective data.*

3.1.1 What are the requirements for admission to the teacher education programs and what is the supporting rationale?

3.1.2 What evidence shows that the admission requirements are being met?

3.1.3 How many students applied for admission to teacher education during the past two years? How many were denied admission? How many who were denied admission were subsequently admitted, and for what reasons?

3.1.4 What objective data, including tests results with national norms, are used for admitting students to teacher education programs?

3.1.5 If the institution admits students who do not meet its usual admission criteria, what special resources does it devote to the remediation or enrichment necessary to enable some of these students to meet the institutional requirements for admission to teacher education programs?

3.1.6 What characteristics of the students admitted are revealed by the data obtained through applying objective and subjective admission criteria?

3.2 Retention of Students in Basic Programs

The nature of the professional studies component in teacher education curricula calls for a high order of academic achievement and growth in technical competence. Grades in course work provide the usual measures of achievement in theoretical work; observations, reports, and other modes of appraisal provide evaluations of laboratory, clinical and practicum experiences. The institution owes it to the student to determine as objectively and systematically as possible specific strengths and weaknesses as they affect his continuing in a teacher education program.

The academic competence of the teacher is a major determinant of effective teaching, but it is not the only one. Prospective teachers demonstrate those personal characteristics which will contribute to, rather than detract from, their performance in the classroom. It is assumed in the standard that the institution has the right and the obligation to consider personal factors as well as academic achievement as a basis for permitting a student to continue in a teacher education program.

Standard: *The institution applies specific criteria for the retention of candidates in basic programs who possess academic competencies and personal characteristics appropriate to the requirements of teaching.*

3.2.1 What objective means are used to evaluate the achievement of students in each area of the professional studies component of the teacher education programs?

3.2.2 What information other than course grades is used to evaluate the achievement of prospective teachers?

3.2.3 What requirements for academic competence must students meet to continue in the teacher education programs?

3.2.4 On the basis of what personal characteristics does the institution screen out students from the teacher education programs?

3.2.5 Under what circumstances, if any, are students who do not meet the institution's requirements for retention permitted to continue in the basic programs?

3.3 Counseling and Advising for Students in Basic Programs

Students planning to be teachers need counseling and advising services that supplement those regularly provided by the institution. Qualified counselors and advisors assist students in assessing their strengths and weaknesses and in planning their programs of study. Prospective teachers need to be informed about professional organizations and agencies as well as current school problems. They also need to know about the wide variety of options available to them in teaching. Graduates may need the help of the institution in finding appropriate teaching positions.

Standard: *The institution has a well-defined plan for counseling and advising students in teacher education.*

3.3.1 What special counseling and advising services are provided for students in teacher education?

3.3.2 What information shows that counselors and advisors for teacher education students know the nature and scope of the teaching profession, the problems of the schools, and the institutional resources available to students?

3.3.3 What information shows that the institution maintains a comprehensive system of records for all prospective teachers which is readily and easily available to faculty members and placement officers for professional purposes?

3.4 Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Development

As members of the college community, prospective teachers have the opportunity and responsibility to express their views regarding the improvement of teacher education programs. Through student organizations, through joint student-faculty groups, and/or through membership on faculty committees, they have clear channels and frequent opportunities to express their views with the assurance that their proposals will influence the development of the teacher education programs offered by the institution.

Standard: *The institution has representative student participation in the evaluation and development of its teacher education programs.*

3.4.1 What evidence shows that students participate in the evaluation and development of preparation programs offered by the institution?

3.4.2 What are the major concerns which students have expressed during the last two years and in what ways have these concerns influenced the development of teacher education programs?

4. Resources and Facilities for Basic Programs

The institution provides an environment which supports the basic teacher education programs it offers. The adequacy of this environment is systematically evaluated in relation to the demands made upon it by curricula, faculty, and students. In the standards, certain elements of this environment are selected for fuller explication without presuming to relegate other elements to insignificance and without assuming that those which are selected are of equal importance. The standards treat the importance of the library, the materials and instructional media center, and physical facilities and other resources in relation to the offering of acceptable teacher education programs.

4.1 Library

The library is viewed as the principal educational materials resource and information storage and retrieval center of an institution. As a principal resource for teaching and learning, the library holdings in teacher education are sufficient in number for the students served and pertinent to the types and levels of programs offered. The recommendations of faculty members and national professional organizations are seriously considered in maintaining and building the collection. Library service assures both students and faculty members access to the holdings.

Standard: *The library is adequate to support the instruction, research, and services pertinent to each teacher education program.*

4.1.1 What evidence shows that the library collection includes:

  a. Standard and contemporary holdings in education (books, microfilms, microfiche copies, etc.)?
  b. Standard periodicals in education?
  c. Such additional specialized books, periodicals, and other resources needed to support each teacher education program?

4.1.2 What evidence shows that the institution, in maintaining and improving the quality of its library holdings in teacher education, seriously considers the recommendations of:

  a. Faculty?
  b. Appropriate national professional organizations and learned societies?
  c. A nationally recognized list (or lists) of books and periodicals?

4.1.3 What information indicates that both students and faculty have access to, and use, the library holdings?

4.1.4 What is the annual record of library expenditures for the total library and for teacher education during the past five years?

4.2 Materials and Instructional Media Center

Modern media and materials are essential elements in the communications system of contemporary society. For this reason, teachers need to understand the technologies that make such media and materials usable in their teaching and need to possess skills in using them. As a means to assist prospective teachers in developing these understandings and skills, the institution makes available to students and faculty members appropriate teaching-learning materials and instructional media. In maintaining and developing the collection of such materials and media, the institution gives serious consideration to the recommendations of faculty members and appropriate national professional organizations.

A program for the preparation of teachers includes the use of teaching-learning materials and instructional media in two important ways: prospective teachers are instructed how to devise and use modern technologies in their teaching, and modern technologies are utilized by the faculty in teaching students.

Standard: *A materials and instructional media center for teacher education is maintained either as a part of the library, or as one or more separate units, and is adequate to support the teacher education programs.*

4.2.1 What information shows that the center contains materials and equipment that:

  a. Are utilized at different grade levels in elementary and secondary schools?
  b. Are utilized for teaching and learning in the teacher education curricula offered by the institution?
  c. Are representative of the teaching specialties offered by the institution?
  d. Reflect recent developments in the teaching of the various subject fields?
  e. Illustrate the wide array of available instructional media (such as films, filmstrips, realia, audiovideo tapes, transparencies, teaching machines, and closed-circuit TV)?

4.2.2 What evidence shows that the institution, in maintaining and improving the quality of the center, seriously considers the recommendations of:

  a. Faculty and staff members?
  b. Appropriate national professional organizations?

4.2.3 What information shows that the center is directed by personnel who are knowledgeable about instructional media and materials?

4.2.4 What information indicates that the center is available to and used by:

  a. Students?
  b. Teacher education faculty members?

4.3 Physical Facilities and Other Resources

Basic teacher education programs draw on the full range of institutional resources to support instruction and research. Assuming that the other aspects of an institution's teacher education programs are acceptable, the adequacy of the physical facilities, equipment, and special resources is judged in terms of the operational requirements of the basic programs offered. It is assumed that such facilities and resources are readily accessible so that faculty and students may effectively pursue instructional objectives.

Standard: *The institution provides physical facilities and other resources essential to the instructional and research activities of each basic program.*

4.3.1 What facts indicate that for each basic teacher education program offered, faculty and students have office space, instructional space, and other space necessary to carry out their responsibilities?

4.3.2 What information shows that the institution draws on the full range of its resources to support its basic programs?

4.3.3 What information indicates that the institution has given serious consideration to the recommendations of faculty members for improving physical facilities and other supporting resources?

5. Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning

Maintenance of acceptable teacher education programs demands a continuous process of evaluation of the graduates of existing programs, modification of existing programs, and long-range planning. It is assumed that faculty and administrators in teacher education evaluate the result of their programs and relate the findings of this evaluation to program development. This requires the continuous review of the institution's objectives for its teacher education programs. It is also assumed that, in its plans for total institutional development, the institution projects plans for the long-range development of teacher education.

5.1 Evaluation of Graduates

Criteria for admission and retention provide some assurance that students of promise and ability enter and continue in teacher education programs. Such criteria do not ensure that students of promise and ability will complete the programs, nor that they will enter the teaching profession, nor that they will perform satisfactorily after becoming teachers. The ultimate criterion for judging a teacher education program is whether it produces competent graduates who enter the profession and perform effectively. An institution committed to the preparation of teachers engages in systematic efforts to evaluate the quality of its graduates and those persons recommended for professional certification. The institution evaluates the teachers it produces at two critical points: when they complete their programs of study, and after they enter the teaching profession.

It is recognized that the means now available for making such evaluations are not fully adequate. Nevertheless, the standard assumes that an institution evaluates the teachers it prepares with the best means now available, and that it attempts to develop improved means for making such evaluations. As progress is made toward more adequate evaluation procedures, this standard will become increasingly important.

Any effort to assess the quality of graduates requires that evaluations be made in relation to the objectives sought. Therefore, institutions use the stated objectives of their teacher education programs as a basis for evaluating the teachers they prepare.

Standard: *The institution conducts a well-defined plan for evaluating the teachers it prepares.*

5.1.1 What information shows that the stated objectives for the teacher education programs are used as a basis for evaluating the teachers prepared by the institution?

5.1.2 What means are used to collect data about teachers prepared in the various programs (graduates and persons recommended for certification):

a. At the point when programs of study are completed?

b. After they enter the teaching profession?

5.1.3 What information shows that the institution is keeping abreast of new developments in the evaluation of teacher education graduates and is engaged in efforts to improve its plan for making such evaluations?

5.1.4 What percent of the teachers prepared by the institution during the last two years actually entered the teaching profession?

5.1.5 What characteristics of teachers prepared by the institution have been revealed through evaluation of graduates?

5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Basic Programs

The institution evaluates the teachers it prepares not only to obtain assessments of their quality, but also to provide information to identify areas in the programs that need strengthening and to suggest new directions for program development. It is assumed in the standard that the results of the evaluations made by the institution are reflected in modifications in the preparation programs.

Standard: *The institution uses the evaluation results in the study, development, and improvement of its teacher education programs.*

5.2.1 What strengths and weaknesses in the teacher education programs are revealed as a result of evaluating teachers prepared by the institution?

5.2.2 What does the institution do to ensure that the results obtained from evaluating the teachers it prepares are translated into appropriate program modifications?

5.3 Long-Range Planning

Institutional plans for future development provide a basis for making decisions in such matters as increasing or limiting enrollment, introducing new programs, expanding and strengthening existing programs, or entering the field of graduate education. Effective long-range planning presupposes that the institution periodically engages in study and research to ascertain whether its present policies and practices are an effective means for accomplishing its purposes. It is assumed that the institutional community will participate in conducting such studies and in projecting plans for the long-range development of teacher education.

Standard: *The institution has plans for the long-range development of teacher education; these plans are part of a design for total institutional development.*

5.3.1 What evidence indicates that the institution has, or is engaged in, studies and/or research to improve its teacher education programs?

5.3.2 What information shows that the faculty for teacher education participates in the formulation of the institution's long-range plans for teacher education?

5.3.3 What is the institution's plan for future development of basic teacher education programs and what rationale supports significant changes that are proposed?

Part II: Advanced Programs

Post-Baccalaureate Programs
for the Advanced Preparation
of Teachers and the Prepara-
tion of Other Professional
School Personnel

G-1. Curricula for Advanced Programs

Curricula for advanced programs are designed to achieve explicitly stated objectives. These objectives are expressed behaviorally and are determined in relation to the professional roles for which the preparation programs are designed. The satisfactory completion of the studies prescribed for a curriculum culminates in an appropriate certificate or degree.

Colleges and universities are responding to current pressing social needs by developing new kinds of programs for the preparation of professional school personnel at the graduate level. These programs, often special or experimental in nature, are subject to the same scrutiny as are the other advanced programs offered by the institution. In some instances the standards, as organized, may not provide the best vehicle for assessing such programs. In these cases, the institution is invited to present its experimental or special programs separately as noted in the Introduction.

As used in these standards, "other professional school personnel" refers to such personnel as superintendents, principals, curriculum specialists, supervisors, and counselors. An "advanced program" refers to a graduate program for the advanced preparation of teachers and/or the preparation of other professional school personnel, and includes the curriculum, the teaching, the learning, and the supporting resources for the teaching and learning process. "Curriculum" includes the courses, seminars, readings, direct and simulated experiences in professional practice (laboratory, clinical, practicum, assistantship, internship, etc.), and research, as categorized in standards G-1.1, G-1.2, and G-1.3. A "program of study" refers to the sequence of courses, seminars, readings, and the direct and simulated experiences in professional practice selected for each graduate student enrolled in an advanced program.

G-1.1 Design of Curricula

Curricula for the advanced preparation of teachers and for the preparation of other professional school personnel are composed of several components combined in patterns designed to achieve the objectives sought. These patterns are based upon assumptions which can be identified by the institution and which reveal themselves in what is done in classroom, laboratory, and field experiences. These patterns are designed so that the instruction offered is appropriate to the degree level (master's, sixth-year, or doctoral) of the various advanced programs. In addition, the design of the patterns provides for the individualization of programs of study. The components of advanced curricula may be described in a variety of ways. In the standards which follow, they are identified as content for the specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, theory relevant to the specialty with direct and simulated experiences in professional practice, and research.

Standard: *Curricula for advanced programs are based on objectives reflecting the institution's conception of the professional roles for which the preparation programs are designed.*

G-1.1.1 For what professional school position does each advanced program prepare personnel (school superintendent, principal, supervisor, specialist, teacher, and/or other positions)?

G-1.1.2 What evidence indicates that specific objectives for the curriculum of each advanced program have been defined and that these objectives reflect the institution's analysis of the professional school position for which candidates are being prepared?

G-1.2 Content of Curricula

Curricula for advanced programs are designed to prepare personnel for different types of school positions and at different degree levels. For this reason, components that are common to such curricula are identified only in terms of general categories of learning experiences as follows: content for the specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, theory relevant to the specialty with direct and simulated experiences in professional practice, and research. The identification of these categories does not preclude the patterning of programs of study to meet the needs of individual students. The individualization of programs of study is treated in another standard.

The "content for the specialty" component for teachers includes advanced study in the subject matter to be taught and in allied fields. For other professional school personnel, this component includes studies in the specialization area and in allied fields.

The "humanistic and behavioral studies" in all advanced curricula include studies that have as their major purpose providing the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood and interpreted at a level beyond that required for the initial preparation of teachers. As in basic programs, the problems of education can be studied with respect to their historical development and the philosophical issues to which they are related, and they can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of behavioral and social sciences. These humanistic and behavioral studies are unique in that they address themselves to the problems of education. The standard does not imply that instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies should be organized or structured in a particular way. Instruction in these studies may be offered in such courses and seminars as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education; or as an integral part of such courses and seminars as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology; or as topics in foundation courses and seminars; or as independent readings or research. In some cases these studies may be part of the content of the specialty.

The "theory with practice" component for teachers includes advanced studies that draw on the body of knowledge about teaching and learning theory. For other professional school personnel, this component includes studies in theory relevant to the particular professional role for which candidates are preparing. Such studies are included so that school personnel can understand the theoretical principles which explain what they do in their professional roles. However, like the study of other empirical theory, the study of "theory relevant to the specialty" requires related experiences in professional practice through which the student may conceptualize principles and interpret their application to practical problems, and through which he further develops his individual style in professional practice.

"Research" as a component in advanced curricula is given special attention in standard G-1.3.

Standard: *The curriculum of each advanced program includes (a) content for the specialty, (b) humanistic and behavioral studies, (c) theory relevant to the specialty with direct and simulated experiences in professional practice, all appropriate to the professional roles for which candidates are being prepared and all differentiated by degree or certificate level.*

G-1.2.1 What information shows that the curriculum of each advanced program includes:
  a. Appropriate content for the specialty?
  b. Humanistic and behavioral studies?
  c. Theory relevant to the specialty?

G-1.2.2 What information shows that the curriculum of each advanced program includes direct and simulated experiences in professional practice which relate significantly to the school position for which the preparation program is designed?

G-1.2.3 How are the studies and experiences in professional practice that are prescribed for the curriculum of each advanced program differentiated by degree or certificate level?

G-1.2.4 What evidence indicates that candidates for degrees or certificates in each advanced program during the last two years have completed the studies and practice experiences identified in the standard?

G-1.3 Research in Advanced Curricula

Research in any discipline or field constitutes an organized effort to solve problems, to advance knowledge, and to test theories. Teachers and other professional school personnel need to have continuous access to research findings, to know how to understand and evaluate them, and to demonstrate skill in adapting them to professional needs. Training in research methods, interpretation, evaluation, and application varies with the degree offered and with the demands of the professional role for which the candidate is preparing.

Standard: *Each advanced curriculum includes the study of research methods and findings; each doctoral curriculum includes the designing and conducting of research.*

G-1.3.1 What provisions are made for including the research component in the curriculum of each advanced program?

G-1.3.2 What information shows that the requirements for research are relevant to the professional role for which the student is preparing?

G-1.3.3 What data show that the requirements for research are met in each student's program of study?

G-1.4 Individualization of Programs of Study

Curricula for advanced programs are individualized—that is, they are translated into programs of study which meet the particular needs of each student. This means that, while the programs of study for all students in a particular advanced program have common elements, the mix of these elements will vary for individual programs of study. To capitalize upon the strengths students bring to the program, to provide opportunities for expression of personal and professional interests, and to make available means whereby each student may improve in areas of weakness, demand great flexibility in planning programs of study.

Standard: *Each advanced curriculum provides for the individualization of students' programs of study.*

G-1.4.1 What data are used to ascertain the professional needs and interests of each candidate at the time of admission and subsequently, as necessary?

G-1.4.2 What evidence shows that programs of study have been planned to meet individual professional needs and interests?

G-1.5 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations

National learned societies and professional associations with special interest in curricula for the preparation of school personnel have significant contributions to make to the improvement of advanced programs. On the basis of extensive study and research, some of these organizations have developed guidelines for the advanced preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. It is expected that an institution will work out the rationale for its advanced curricula with due consideration given to such guidelines appropriate to the respective advanced programs offered. Due consideration means that the institution is acquainted with these guidelines and has examined them critically in relation to developing its advanced curricula.

Standard: *In planning and developing curricula for its advanced programs, the institution gives due consideration to guidelines developed by national learned societies and professional associations for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.*

G-1.5.1 What guidelines has the institution considered in developing the curricula of its various advanced programs?

G-1.5.2 What information shows that the guidelines identified in G-1.5.1 have been critically examined in relation to the planning and development of the advanced programs offered by the institution?

G-1.6 Quality Controls

The institution provides the faculty competence and the physical resources that are needed to support its graduate curricula. In addition, it creates conditions under which the graduate curricula can be effectively implemented. In the three standards which follow, certain quality controls are selected for fuller explication without presuming these controls to be the only important ones. They are the institution's policies for determining which courses and seminars are counted for graduate credit in programs of study, its policies for offering certain courses and seminars at the graduate level, and its requirements for full-time residence study.

G-1.6.1 Graduate Credit. Advanced programs require a level of study and performance beyond that required for the beginning professional. For this reason the institution establishes clear policies regarding work prerequisite to graduate credit for courses, seminars, readings, and/or other learning experiences which are included in students' programs of study.

Standard: *Institutional policies preclude the granting of graduate credit for study which is remedial or which is designed to remove deficiencies in meeting the requirements for admission to advanced programs.*

G-1.6.1a What regulations govern the granting of graduate credit in the advanced programs?

G-1.6.1b What evidence shows that the institution's regulations for granting graduate credit are enforced?

G-1.6.2 Graduate Level Courses. The character of advanced programs is influenced by the mature status and the professional motivation of graduate students. While there may be good reasons for admitting undergraduate students to some graduate courses, it is assumed that for substantial periods of time in advanced programs, students are in instructional groups in which only graduate students are enrolled.

Standard: *At least one-half of the requirements of curricula leading to a master's degree and to a sixth-year certificate or degree are met by courses, seminars, and other learning experiences offered only to graduate students; at least two-thirds of the requirements of curricula leading to the doctorate are met by courses, seminars, and other learning experiences offered only to graduate students.*

G-1.6.2a What is the institution's policy with regard to the proportion of undergraduate work that may be counted toward degrees or the proportion of graduate study that must be included in degree programs at each level (master's, sixth-year, doctoral)?

G-1.6.2b What evidence shows that the stated policy is enforced?

G-1.6.3 Residence Study. One of the desirable characteristics of advanced study is that students learn from each other and through close association with the faculty in a climate that stimulates research and scholarly effort. This is not possible unless the student spends a substantial block of time in full-time residence at the institution.

Standard: *Some period of full-time continuous residence study, or provision for comparable experiences, is required for candidates pursuing advanced degrees other than the doctorate; at least one academic year of full-time continuous residence study is required for candidates pursuing the doctorate.*

G-1.6.3a What are the institution's requirements for full-time residence study for each degree (or certificate) program? What are the precise definitions of "full-time" and "residence"?

G-1.6.3b What evidence shows that the residence study requirement was met by those candidates who received the master's degree and the sixth-year certificate or degree during the past two years?

G-1.6.3c What evidence shows that the one-year, full-time residence study requirement was met by each candidate who received the doctorate during the past two years?

G-1.7 Control of Advanced Programs

The quality of the graduate programs depends on the quality of the faculty and students as well as on the content and design of the several curricula. It follows that the institution needs a structure by which the faculty can control every phase of the advanced programs. Procedures for admitting students, planning programs, adding new courses, hiring staff, and determining requirements for degrees are carefully organized and systematized, and faculty members are involved in the formation and execution of both policy and procedures.

Schools or departments of education are sometimes expected to provide training for teachers and other professional school personnel through courses, seminars, and workshops that are offered primarily at the convenience of school personnel in the field. Frequently this training is applied toward meeting the requirements of a graduate certificate or degree. The institution ensures that such courses, seminars, and workshops—regardless of the location and time at which the instruction takes place—are taught by qualified faculty members and supported by essential learning resources. In addition, the institution ensures that the requirements for earning credit are comparable to those made in regular graduate offerings.

Standard: *The primary responsibility for initiation, development, and implementation of advanced programs lies with the education faculty.*

G-1.7.1 What is the administrative structure for controlling the advanced programs and what is the supporting rationale?

G-1.7.2 How are advanced programs initiated? What bodies approve changes and new programs?

G-1.7.3 What activities of the education faculty demonstrate that they have assumed responsibility for the initiation, development, and approval of all advanced programs?

G-1.7.4 What information shows that the faculty controls the quality of all courses, seminars, and workshops offered primarily at the convenience of school personnel in the field (such as at off-campus locations and at "irregular" hours) and counted as credit toward graduate degrees or certificates?

G-2. Faculty for Advanced Programs

The specialized nature of the content of advanced programs requires faculty with a high degree of specialization and competence. The competence of faculty as evidenced by their formal preparation and by their commitment to scholarship, research, and professional practice is critical to the quality of instruction offered. The following standards deal with aspects of faculty competence in relation to the development, execution, and review of the advanced programs, and with conditions conducive to effective faculty performance. "Faculty for advanced programs" is defined to include those members of the faculty who carry responsibilities for instruction, advisement, supervision, and research in the graduate programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and for the preparation of other professional school personnel.

G-2.1 Preparation of Faculty

The academic preparation of faculty members is one indicator of their competence. It is assumed that the doctor's degree in a well-defined field of specialization, earned in a regionally-accredited institution or a recognized foreign institution, is the minimal requirement for offering graduate instruction in advanced programs. Exceptions to that principle are made only in unusual cases when the faculty member—by virtue of publication, research, or professional recognition—has demonstrated his competence for independent scholarly activity.

Competence of faculty members is also determined by their scholarly performance and their experience in professional practice. Faculty members are expected to display a high order of active scholarship and to have done original research and they should have appropriate experience in professional practice to support the respective advanced programs.

Standard: *Faculty members teaching at the master's level in advanced programs hold the doctorate with advanced study in each field of specialization in which they are teaching or have demonstrated competence in such fields; those teaching at the sixth-year and doctoral levels hold the doctorate with study in each field of specialization in which they are teaching and conducting research. Faculty members who conduct the advanced programs at all degree levels are engaged in scholarly activity that supports their fields of special-*

ization and have experience which relates directly to their respective fields.

G-2.1.1 What evidence shows that each faculty member teaching at the master's level holds the doctorate from a regionally-accredited institution or a recognized foreign university with advanced study in each field of specialization in which he teaches, or has demonstrated competence in his field of specialization?

G-2.1.2 What evidence shows that each faculty member teaching at the sixth-year and/or doctoral level holds the doctorate from a regionally-accredited institution or a recognized foreign university with study in each field of specialization in which he teaches and/or conducts research?

G-2.1.3 What information shows that each faculty member who teaches and/or conducts research in the advanced programs has had field experiences during the past five years which support his teaching and research assignments?

G-2.1.4 What data show that each faculty member who teaches in the advanced programs has been engaged during the past two years in writing, research, and/or consultation, and that these activities support his teaching assignment?

G-2.2 Composition of Faculty for Doctoral Degree Programs

The adequacy of faculty for advanced programs is determined not only by their academic preparation, experience, and scholarly performance, but also by the distribution of their specializations and by the number of faculty members available for the tasks to be done. This is so, particularly for faculty for doctoral programs. A doctoral program requires a faculty that includes specialists for each field of specialization, and in addition, at least three specialists in fields which directly support each degree program.

Standard: *The faculty for each advanced program leading to the doctorate includes at least one full-time person who holds the doctorate with specialization in the field in which the degree is offered, and at least three persons who hold the doctorate in fields which directly support each degree program.*

G-2.2.1 What evidence shows that there is at least one full-time person who holds the doctorate with appropriate specialization for each advanced program in which the doctor's degree is offered?

G-2.2.2 What data confirm that there are at least three specialists who hold doctorates in fields which directly support each degree program offered?

G-2.3 Conditions for Faculty Service

The faculty is the major determinant of the quality of advanced programs. Conditions that make possible a high level of performance include reasonable faculty load, adequate support for faculty research, opportunities for faculty development, and essential supporting services.

Faculty load policies give due consideration to the responsibilities assigned to a graduate faculty member, including the planning and teaching of courses and seminars, advisement of students, supervision of experiences in professional practice and of dissertations, research activities, participation in program development, and activities requisite to professional development. The policies establish a maximum limit for faculty teaching loads and this limit is lower than that established for the loads of undergraduate faculty. Furthermore, these policies take into account the special demands that are made on faculty who carry responsibilities for doctoral programs.

The institution provides time and some financial support to enable faculty members to engage in research. Faculty in advanced programs engage in research to contribute to the solution of educational problems, to expand the field of knowledge in education, and to provide a model for student learning.

To maintain and to improve the quality of its faculty, the institution has a plan for faculty development which provides such opportunities as in-service education, sabbatical leave, travel support, summer leaves, intra- and inter-institutional visitation, and fellowships. In addition, time is allocated in the load of a faculty member so that he can continue his scholarly development.

The institution recognizes that the quality of its instructional programs can be compromised if faculty members dissipate their energy in subprofessional tasks. Therefore, provision is made for supporting services (such as those provided by instructional media technicians, instructional assistants, research assistants, project assistants, secretaries, and clerks) that permit faculty members to fulfill their instructional, research, and other responsibilities at a high level of performance.

Standard: *The institution provides conditions essential to the effective performance by the faculty in the advanced programs.*

G-2.3.1 What is the plan for taking into account all professional duties and activities of the faculty in determining load?

G-2.3.2 What has been the total load assigned to each faculty member in the advanced programs over all terms during the last two years and what are the duties (such as teaching courses, advising students, supervising experiences in professional practice, supervising or chairing dissertations, research, committee assignments, professional development, and others) that make up each load?

G-2.3.3 What is the institution's policy regarding the provision of time for faculty to engage in research, and what evidence shows that this policy is being implemented?

G-2.3.4 What evidence indicates that the institution provides financial support to encourage research activities by faculty in the advanced programs?

G-2.3.5 What is the institution's plan for the continuous professional development of faculty in the advanced programs and what evidence shows that it is operative?

G-2.3.6 What is the plan for allocating supporting services to faculty in the advanced programs and what evidence shows that such services are provided?

G-2.4 Part-Time Faculty

Successful professionals outside the institution often can add strength to advanced programs and frequently the demand for a particular course is too small to warrant the employment of a full-time faculty member. The standard does not specify an acceptable ratio of part-time to full-time faculty. However, in the interests of operating acceptable graduate programs, the institution prevents the fragmentation of instruction and the erosion of program quality that can accompany excessive use of part-time faculty.

Standard: *Part-time faculty meet the requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty and are employed only when they can make special contributions to advanced programs.*

G-2.4.1 What proportion of each advanced program is assigned to part-time faculty?

G-2.4.2 What evidence shows that each part-time faculty member meets the requirements for appointment to the full-time graduate faculty?

G-2.4.3 What reasons support the utilization of each part-time faculty member in the advanced programs?

G-3. Students in Advanced Programs

Graduate programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and for the preparation of other professional school personnel require students of promise and ability whose success in professional practice can be reasonably predicted. The quality of the advanced programs is significantly influenced by the quality of students admitted because of the greater dependence on self-instruction and individual scholarship required by study at the graduate level. Attention to the characteristics of students admitted to, retained in, and graduated from advanced programs is essential to designing and maintaining acceptable programs. It is assumed in the standards which follow that an institution applies criteria for admission to, and retention in, its advanced programs; provides for supervision of students' programs of study; provides opportunities for student participation in program evaluation and development; and that it evaluates graduates. The evaluation of graduates is treated in another section of the standards.

G-3.1 Admission to Advanced Programs

Students enter advanced programs at various points in their careers and with a variety of academic backgrounds. Moreover, different fields of specialization require different abilities: some are more theoretical than others; some place more emphasis on personal relations than do others. Thus, there can be no single set of admission requirements for all programs. The institution, nevertheless, establishes and applies a number of criteria for admitting students to each advanced program and to each program level (master's, sixth-year, doctoral). These criteria, both objective and subjective, reflect a rational process for selecting students whose success in the respective specialties can be reasonably predicted.

Standard: *The institution applies specific criteria for admission to each advanced program at each level; these criteria require the use of both objective and subjective data.*

G-3.1.1 What are the admission requirements for each advanced program and at each level (master's, sixth-year, doctoral)?

G-3.1.2 What evidence indicates that the institution's requirements for admission to advanced programs are being met?

G-3.1.3 What objective data, including test results with national norms, are used for admitting students to advanced programs?

G-3.1.4 What characteristics of the students admitted to advanced programs are revealed by the data obtained through applying objective and subjective criteria?

G-3.2 Retention of Students in Advanced Programs

The maintenance of acceptable advanced programs demands that the institution establish and apply criteria not only for the selection of students, but also for the continuous screening of those students who have been admitted. The profession requires that the practitioner demonstrate academic and technical competence as well as those personal characteristics which are appropriate to the requirements of the school position for which he is preparing.

Because the failing grade in graduate courses is rarely given, "satisfactory progress" frequently has to be judged by subjective criteria. However, subjective judgments are inadequate unless the institution first has ways of formally collecting and evaluating these judgments, and then of translating them into a decision on the student's status.

Standard: *The institution applies specific criteria for the retention of candidates in advanced programs who possess academic competencies and personal characteristics appropriate to the requirements of the professional roles for which they are being prepared.*

G-3.2.1 What is the plan and its supporting rationale for ensuring that only qualified candidates are permitted to continue in each advanced program and at each program level (master's, sixth-year, doctoral)?

G-3.2.2 How many students have not been permitted to continue in each advanced program during the past two years and for what reasons? Under what circumstances, if any, may such students reenter the advanced programs?

G-3.2.3 What is the average and the range for the length of time required which students took to complete master's programs during the past two years? Sixth-year programs? Doctoral programs?

G-3.3 Planning and Supervision of Students' Programs of Study

The same considerations that make admission to an advanced program a highly individualized matter also operate in the planning and supervision of each graduate student's program of study. Planning of each program of study is done jointly by the student concerned and an officially designated faculty advisor. Responsibility for sponsoring each thesis, dissertation, or field study is assigned to an official advisor who is a member of the faculty conducting the advanced programs and whose specialization is appropriate to the thesis, dissertation, or field study topic. It is assumed that both students and faculty members have a choice in the assignment of advisors. The intent of this standard is to prevent perfunctory program planning while protecting the flexibility needed for individualizing programs of study.

Standard: *The program of study for each student in the advanced programs is jointly planned by the student and a member of the faculty; the program of study for each doctoral candidate is approved by a faculty committee; the sponsorship of each thesis, dissertation, or field study is the responsibility of a member of the faculty with specialization in the area of the thesis, dissertation, or field study.*

G-3.3.1 What provisions ensure that each graduate student's program of study is jointly planned by the student and an official faculty advisor?

G-3.3.2 What evidence indicates that each doctoral candidate's program of study is approved by a faculty committee?

G-3.3.3 What evidence shows that the sponsorship of each thesis, dissertation, or field study (master's, sixth-year, doctoral) is assigned to a qualified member of the faculty?

G-3.3.4 What information indicates that both students and faculty members have a choice in the assignment of advisors?

G-3.4 Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Development

As members of the higher education community, graduate students in the advanced programs have the opportunity and responsibility to express their views regarding the improvement of the respective preparation programs in which they are enrolled. Through student organizations, through joint student-faculty groups, and/or through membership on faculty committees, students have clear channels and frequent opportunities to express their views with the assurance that their proposals will influence the development of the advanced programs offered by the institution.

Standard: *The institution has representative student participation in the evaluation and development of its advanced programs.*

G-3.4.1 What evidence shows that graduate students participate in the evaluation and development of advanced programs?

G-3.4.2 What are the major concerns which students have expressed during the last two years and in what ways have these concerns influenced the development of advanced programs?

G-4. Resources and Facilities for Advanced Programs

The institution provides resources and physical facilities which support the advanced programs it offers. The adequacy of these resources and facilities is systematically evaluated in relation to the demands made upon them by advanced curricula, faculty, and students.

Advanced programs make greater demands on institutional resources than do undergraduate programs. This is especially so for doctoral programs. Institutions offering or proposing to offer advanced programs should demonstrate that the resources are available for these programs and without their impairing the quality of the undergraduate programs in the same institution.

G-4.1 Library

The adequacy of library holdings is a major factor in establishing the quality of advanced programs. As the principal educational materials resource and the information storage and retrieval center of an institution, the library holdings are adequate for the number of students and faculty to be served, and pertinent to the kind and level of graduate programs offered. The operation of advanced programs requires library resources substantially larger than those required for basic programs. The library resources required for doctoral programs vary widely but, in any case, they are substantial, and considerably exceed those for master's programs.

The recommendations of faculty members and professional organizations are given serious consideration in maintaining and building the collection. Adequate library service is provided to assure that students and faculty members have access to the holdings.

Standard: *The library provides resources that are adequate to support instruction, independent study, and research required for each advanced program.*

G-4.1.1 What evidence indicates that the library collection includes standard and contemporary holdings (books, microfilms, microfiche copies, periodicals) to support each advanced program?

G-4.1.2 What information shows that the institution, in maintaining and improving the quality of its library holdings, gives serious considera- to the recommendations of:

- a. Faculty members?
- b. Appropriate national professional organizations and learned societies?
- c. A nationally recognized list (or lists) of books and periodicals?

G-4.1.3 What information indicates that students in advanced programs have access to, and use, the library holdings?

G-4.1.4 What is the annual record of library expenditures for the total library and for the advanced programs during the past five years?

G-4.2 Physical Facilities and Other Resources

Advanced programs draw on the full range of institutional resources to support instruction and research. The extent to which physical facilities, equipment, and specialized resources are required for graduate study depends on the particular program. It is assumed that such facilities and resources are readily accessible so that faculty and students may effectively pursue instructional objectives.

Standard: *The institution provides physical facilities and other resources essential to the instructional and research activities of each advanced program.*

G-4.2.1 What information confirms that faculty and students have instructional, research, and office space necessary to carry out their responsibilities?

G-4.2.2 What evidence shows that specialized equipment (such as open and closed television, computers) and laboratories necessary to support each advanced program are available, and that they are used by faculty and students?

G-4.2.3 What information indicates that the institution draws on the full range of its resources to support its advanced programs?

G-4.2.4 What information shows that the institution has given serious consideration to the recommendations of faculty members for improving physical facilities and other supporting resources?

G-5. Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning

Maintenance of acceptable programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and for the preparation of other professional school personnel requires the systematic evaluation of the quality of the professionals who complete the programs, modification of existing programs, and long-range planning. It is recognized that the relationship between effectiveness of preparation and quality of effort in the profession may be difficult to assess; but without continuing and conscientious effort, planning for and making improvements have little solid basis. The development of effective processes for evaluation, the impact of the evaluation results on the curricula of the advanced programs and systematic planning for the future are all critical elements for assessing the quality of advanced programs in terms of the objectives sought. Accordingly, the institution engages in the continuous review of program objectives through the interrelation of the curricula, faculty, students, and the resources available for the tasks.

G-5.1 Evaluation of Graduates

Criteria for admission to, and retention in, advanced programs provide some assurance that students of promise and ability enter and continue in programs offered, but such criteria do not ensure that candidates of promise and ability will complete the programs, nor that they will enter school positions for which they have been prepared, nor that they will perform satisfactorily after assuming their professional roles. The ultimate criterion for judging advanced programs is whether they produce graduates who enter the profession and perform effectively. The institution evaluates its graduates at two critical points: when they complete their programs of study, and after they enter the professional roles for which they have prepared.

It is recognized that the means now available for making such evaluations are not fully adequate. Nevertheless, the standard assumes that an institution evaluates the school personnel it prepares with the best means now available, and that it attempts to develop improved means for making such evaluations. As progress is made toward more adequate evaluation procedures, this standard will become increasingly important.

Any effort to assess the quality of graduates requires that evaluations be made in relation to the objectives sought. Therefore, an institution uses the stated objectives of a particular advanced program as a basis for evaluating the graduates of that program.

Standard: *The institution conducts a well-defined plan for evaluating the teachers and other professional school personnel it prepares at the graduate level.*

G-5.1.1 What information shows that the stated objectives for each advanced program are used as a basis for evaluating the graduates of the respective programs?

G-5.1.2 What means are used to collect data about teachers and other professional school personnel prepared in the advanced programs:

a. At the point of program completion?
b. After they enter the professional roles for which they are prepared?

G-5.1.3 What information shows that the institution is keeping abreast of new developments in the evaluation of graduates and is engaged in efforts to improve its plan for making such evaluations?

G-5.1.4 What percent of the teachers and other professional school personnel prepared at the graduate level during the last two years actually entered the professional roles for which they prepared?

G-5.1.5 What characteristics of school personnel prepared in the advanced programs have been revealed through evaluation of graduates?

G-5.2 Use of Evaluation Results to Improve Advanced Programs

The institution evaluates the teachers and other professional school personnel it prepares not only to obtain assessments of their quality, but also to provide information which identifies areas in the advanced programs that need strengthening and information which suggests new directions for program development. It is assumed that the results of the evaluations made by the institution are reflected in modifications in the preparation programs.

Standard: *The institution uses the evaluation results in the study, development, and improvement of its advanced programs.*

G-5.2.1 What strengths and weaknesses in the advanced programs have been revealed through evaluation of graduates?

G-5.2.2 What does the institution do to ensure that the results obtained from evaluating its graduates are translated into appropriate program modifications?

G-5.3 Long-Range Planning

Institutional plans for future development provide a basis for making decisions in such matters as increasing or limiting enrollment, expanding and/or upgrading present programs, discontinuing programs, or introducing new programs. Effective long-range planning presupposes that an institution periodically reevaluates program objectives in relation to societal changes, and that it engages in study and research to ascertain whether its present policies and practices are an effective means for accomplishing its purposes. It is assumed that the institutional community participates in conducting such studies and in projecting the long-run plans for advanced programs.

Standard: *The institution has plans for the long-range development of its advanced programs; these plans are part of a design for total institutional development.*

G-5.3.1 What evidence indicates that the institution has, or is, engaged in studies and/or institutional research to improve its advanced programs?

G-5.3.2 What information shows that the faculty members conducting the advanced programs participate in the formulation of the institution's plans for the long-range development of these programs?

G-5.3.3 What is the institution's plan for future development of advanced programs and what rationale supports significant changes that are proposed?

I

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NEW STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITING TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE FORMER NCATE STANDARDS

Karl Massanari, Associate Secretary
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

January 1970

This analysis is essentially a study guide to assist readers in comparing the new standards for the accreditation of teacher education with the former ones used by NCATE. It focuses on the differences rather than the similarities between the two sets of standards. The identification of the major differences should not be interpreted as relegating the similarities to insignificance. The existence of common elements in the former and new standards may be more significant than the fact that there are differences. It is assumed that these common elements are readily observable to the reader.

The chief differences are treated under four headings: differences between the new and former standards from an overall viewpoint, new elements in the new standards, elements which receive greater emphasis in the new standards, and elements which receive less emphasis in the new standards.

A. Differences between the new and former standards from an overall viewpoint.

1. The organization of the recommended new standards is different from that of the former standards.

   a. The new standards are in two parts: Part I is applicable to basic programs (programs for the initial preparation of teachers through the fifth-year level, including M.A.T. programs); Part II to advanced programs (post-baccalaureate programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and the preparation of other professional school personnel). The former standards were not differentiated in this way; one basic set of standards was applicable to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

   b. The new standards in both Parts I and II are organized in five sections: curricula; faculty; students; resources; and evaluation, program review, and planning. Each section contains a number of standards, 22 in Part I and 22 in Part II. The former standards, seven in number, treated: objectives, organization and administration, student personnel programs and services, faculty, curricula, professional laboratory experiences, and facilities and instructional materials.

   c. Each section of the new standards has an introductory statement which states assumptions and explicates interrelationships among the various standards. Each standard is preceded by a preamble which gives its rationale, states the underlying assumptions, interprets its meaning, and defines terms. The questions which follow each standard are designed to elicit the kinds of evidence that will show the extent to which the institution possesses the characteristics identified in the preamble and standard.

2. The unique character of graduate study in teacher education is emphasized in a number of ways in Part II of the new standards. In a number of instances these standards call for differentiation by degree or certificate level, as well as by the nature of the professional role for which the preparation program is designed.

3. The new standards in both Parts I and II permit considerable latitude in designing and conducting preparation programs for teachers and other professional school personnel.

4. The new standards recognize that responsible experimentation and innovation are essential to improvement of teacher education programs. A deliberate attempt has been made to encourage individuality and innovation in institutional planning and programming. Provision is made for an institution to submit experimental programs separately for review and evaluation. (Introduction - "Institutional Experimentation and Innovation"; introductory statements to 1, G-1, and 3.)

5. Throughout the new standards, emphasis is given to the importance of the institution's rationale for what it does. It has a rationale for what it does and is capable of explicating how this rationale is implemented.

6. The new standards stress the importance of interrelating the various aspects of teacher education programs. (See especially the introductory statements to the five sections - curricula, faculty, students, resources, evaluation - in both Parts I and II.)

   Selected exerpts which illustrate such interrelationships:

   "The faculty constantly scrutinizes curricula in relation to the characteristics and needs of the students enrolled and in relation to the resources required to support the offering of acceptable programs." (Introductory statement to 2.)

   "Attention to the characteristics of students admitted to, retained in, and graduated from teacher education is essential to designing and maintaining acceptable programs." (Introductory statement to 3.)

   "The adequacy of this environment (resources and facilities) is systematically evaluated in relation to the demands made upon it by curricula, faculty, and students." (Introductory statement to 4.)

   "It is assumed that faculty and administrators in teacher education evaluate the result of their programs and relate the findings of this evaluation to program development. This requires the continuous review of the institution's objectives for its teacher education programs." (Introductory statement to 5.)

7. The new standards are not viewed as the "final word" in accreditation standards. Provision is made for their continuous review, evaluation, and revision.

B. New elements in the new standards

The institution which is accreditable is expected to give evidence that it possesses the characteristics listed below. These characteristics are clearly explicated in the new standards; in the former standards, some are implied, others are not specifically mentioned.

1. The institution conducts a well-defined plan for evaluating the teachers and other professional school personnel it prepares. (5.1, G-5.1)

2. The institution uses the results of such evaluations not only for assessments of the quality of its graduates, but also as feedback for the study, development and improvement of its preparation programs. (5.2, G-5.2)

3. The institution has plans for the long-range development of its basic and advanced teacher education programs and these plans are part of a design for total institutional development. (5.3, G-5.3)

4. In planning and developing basic and advanced curricula, the institution gives due consideration to guidelines for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel developed by national learned societies and professional associations. (1.4, G-1.5)

5. The institution has representative student participation in the evaluation and development of its teacher education programs, both basic and advanced. (3.4, G-3.4)

6. The professional studies component in basic curricula incorporates the findings of research and provides experiences for students in their interpretation and use. (1.3.1c, 1.3.2c, and 1.3.3d)

7. Each advanced curriculum includes the study of research methods and findings; and each doctoral curriculum includes the designing and conducting of research. (G-1.3) In addition, the institution provides time and some financial support to enable faculty members to engage in research. (G-2.3)

8. The curriculum of each advanced program includes, among other elements, direct and simulated experiences in professional practice appropriate to the professional roles for which candidates are being prepared and differentiated by degree or certificate level. (G-1.2)

9. The competence of the faculty for basic programs is determined, in part, by the quality of instruction provided. (2.1, especially 2.1.4)

10. The competence of faculty members for basic programs is also determined, in part, by the extent and nature of their involvement with elementary and secondary schools. (2.2)

11. The institution ensures that all courses, seminars, and workshops offered for graduate credit are taught by qualified faculty members and supported by essential learning resources. This includes all such courses, seminars, and workshops that are offered primarily at the convenience of school personnel in the field (e.g. courses taught at off-campus locations and at "irregular" hours). In addition, the institution ensures that the requirements for earning credit are comparable to those made in regular graduate offerings. (G-1.7, especially G-1.7.4)

C. Elements which receive greater emphasis in the new standards

The new standards place more emphasis on the importance of certain aspects of a teacher education program for evaluation purposes.

1. The objectives for each preparation program are determined in relation to both the professional role for which the program is designed and the behavioral outcomes sought. (Introductory statements to 1. Curricula for Basic Programs and G-1. Curricula for Advanced Programs, 1.1, and G-1.1)

2. The curricular design of preparation programs is based on the institution's conception of the professional role for which the program is designed. (1.1, G-1.1)

3. The stated objectives for each preparation program are used as a basis for evaluating the graduates of the respective programs. (5.1, G-5.1)

4. The design of the basic and advanced curricula reflects the judgment of faculty members, students, graduates, and the profession as a whole. (Introductory statements to 1. Curricula for Basic Programs and G-1. Curricula for Advanced Programs)

5. The design and contents of the basic and advanced curricula reflect an awareness of research findings in teacher education. (Introductory statements to 1. and G-1.; 1.3, especially 1.3.1c, 1.3.2c, 1.3.3d; 5.2; G-5.2; 5.3, and G-5.3)

6. Programs of study for students are individualized. (1.2, especially 1.2.5; 1.3.3; 1.3.4; 3.3; G-1.4; G-3.3)

7. Experimentation and innovation in program design are encouraged. (Introductory statements to 1. and G-1.)

8. The new standards reconceptualize the content of general studies and that of professional studies in curricula for basic programs. (1.2, 1.3)

9. The general studies component in basic programs is prescribed with respect to two characteristics: at least one-third of each curriculum is composed of general studies; and such studies consist of work in each of three broad areas - symbolics of information, natural and behavioral sciences, and humanities. (1.2)

10. The professional studies component (note that the term "professional education" is not used) in basic curricula includes content of the teaching specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and practicum. This component is spelled out differently and with greater specificity than in the former standards. The designation of these elements or categories, however, is not intended to prescribe a particular design for teacher education. (1.3)

11. The content for the teaching specialty standard specifies two kinds of knowledge that are needed by the teacher: one is the knowledge that is to be taught to pupils; the other is the knowledge that may be needed by the teacher as a background for the teaching of his particular specialty. (1.3.1)

12. Laboratory and clinical experiences are integrated with instruction in theory, and in addition are effectively planned and supervised. The standards differentiate between different types of "pre-student teaching laboratory experiences." (1.3.3)

13. Practicum is viewed as a period of experience in professional practice during which the student tests and reconstructs the theory which he has evolved and during which he further develops his own teaching style. It presupposes the learning experiences included in all other professional studies and is not regarded as a substitute for them. It is a more complete and concrete learning activity than laboratory and clinical experience. (1.3.4)

14. As is true in the former standards, the new ones regard the competence of the faculty as the crucial factor in teacher education. However, the new standards are more explicit with respect to the nature of the academic preparation of faculty members. In those cases where faculty members do not meet the requisite advanced graduate work, provision is made to establish competence on the basis of demonstrated scholarly performance. (2.1, G-2.1)

15. The faculty is significantly involved in designing, approving, evaluating and developing teacher education programs. (1.5, introductory statement to 2., G-1.7)

16. The faculty is engaged in systematic efforts to improve the quality of instruction provided. (Introductory statement to 2.)

17. With respect to the admission of students to basic and advanced programs, the new standards specify that both objective and subjective data should be used in the application of admission criteria. (3.1, G-3.1)

18. In establishing and applying criteria for the retention of students in basic and advanced programs, the institution has the right and the obligation to consider factors other than academic achievement as a basis for permitting students to continue in programs to which they have been admitted. (3.2, G-3.2)

19. The institution maintains a materials and instructional media center which supports the teacher education programs offered. A preparation program includes the use of teaching-learning materials and instructional media in two important ways: prospective teachers are instructed how to devise and use modern technologies in their teaching, and modern technologies are utilized by the faculty in teaching students. (4.2)

20. The institution draws on the full range of its resources to support instruction and research. (4.3, G-4.2)

21. The institution gives serious consideration to the recommendations of faculty members and national professional organizations in maintaining and building the library collection. (4.1, G-4.1)

D. Elements which receive less emphasis in the new standards.

1. The former standards assume that if the process (curriculum, resources) of preparing teachers is satifactory, graduates of acceptable quality will be produced. The new standards assume that institutions can to some degree assess the quality of its graduate and, therefore, the process of preparing teachers, per se, receives somewhat less emphasis for evaluation purposes.

2. Proportionately, less emphasis in the new standards is given to the importance of patterns of organization and administration. One of the seven former standards treats organization and administration of teacher education. One of the 22 new standards (in both Parts I and II) deals with control of program. (1.5, G-1.7)

3. There is less emphasis in the new standards on the "single program" concept. That is, an institution may have more than one approved preparation program for elementary teachers and/or for secondary teachers. Such programs are, of course, subject to the conditions as specified in the new standards.

KM:sb

J

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Contract No. OEC-3-8-080243-0030-(010)

Final Financial Report

AACTE-NCATE Cooperative
Feasibility Project

From: 3/15/68
To: 9/30/69

Category	Amended Budget	Expense To Date	Expense This Date	Balance
Direct Costs:				
Personnel				
Project Director Salary	$16,187.50	$16,141.63	$ 430.00	$ 45.87
Staff Assistant Salary	13,903.85	14,525.60	515.00	(621.75)
Consultants	400.00	500.00	-0-	(100.00)
Clerical Help	528.95	460.90	-0-	68.05
Employee Benefits				
Retirement- TIAA	1,040.63	1,382.23	202.77	(341.60)
Social Security-FICA	678.15	1,156.89	379.00	(478.74)
Travel				
Air Travel - Expense	32,433.65	30,352.38	2,999.24	2,081.27
Per Diem - Expense	11,100.00	10,952.37	126.79	147.63
Communications	750.00	680.55	5.40	69.45
Final Report Costs	1,000.00	1,870.18	1,660.70	(870.18)
Sub-Total of Direct Costs	78,022.73	78,022.73	6,318.90	-0-
Indirect Costs:				
20% of Direct Costs	15,668.55*	15,604.55	1,263.78	64.00
GRAND TOTAL	$93,691.28	$93,627.28	$7,582.68	$ 64.00

* Note: Very Important

(1) Actual rate per contractor's books for 1968 20%
(2) Actual rate per contractor's books for 1969 42.68%

(2) 1969 audit scheduled --- 30% provisional O/H negotiated 3/30/70

by Edward C Pomeroy
Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive
Director
March 31, 1970